1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
3	=======================================
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION HP14-002
5	OF DAKOTA ACCESS, LLC FOR AN ENERGY FACILITY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT
6	THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE
7	_ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
8	Transcript of Proceedings November 30, 2015
9	
10	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
11	CHRIS NELSON, CHAIRMAN GARY HANSON, COMMISSIONER
12	RICHARD SATTGAST, ACTING COMMISSIONER
13	COMMISSION STAFF
14	Rolayne Ailts Wiest Kristen Edwards
15	Karen Cremer Adam de Hueck
16	Greg Rislov Brian Rounds
17	Darren Kearney Katlyn Gustafson
18	Raciyii Gustaison
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR
24	
25	

CHAIRMAN NELSON: My name is Chairman Chris
Nelson. I have with me Commissioner Hanson and Acting
Commissioner Sattgast.

2.3

We have one item of business today, and that is in HP14-002 In the Matter of the Application of Dakota Access LLC for an Energy Facility Permit to Construct the Dakota Access Pipeline.

Questions to be resolved today are shall the Commission grant, deny, or grant with conditions a permit to Dakota Access for construction of the pipeline pursuant to SDCL 49-41B-24? And shall the Commission grant the Joint Motion regarding stipulated facts of Findings of Fact, Conditions, and Exhibits as requested by the City of Sioux Falls and Dakota Access? Or how shall the Commission proceed?

For the benefit of my fellow Commissioners how I thought we would proceed at this point, we have received two rounds of briefing from all of the parties. I want to say thank you to all of the parties for that. That was very helpful to us.

So my anticipation is that at this point the Commissioners would ask any clarifying or follow-up questions from that briefing or any issues that may be outstanding in our minds, and then we would move to open the floor for motions.

1 Does that make sense? 2 With that, questions from the Commission. 3 COMMISSIONER HANSON: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I 4 have one of Mr. Kearney. 5 I appreciate the work that you did in figuring 6 out what the bonding would be, what you proposed that the 7 bonding would be. 8 Forgive me. I was trying to find in the XL Pipeline how many spreads that they had. And Dakota 10 Access stated that they will have three spreads. 11 Did you take that into consideration? I was 12 thinking that XL was only going to have two. Was I 13 mistaken, or do you remember? 14 MR. KEARNEY: Well, I didn't factor in the 15 number of spreads. I just went off the methodology that 16 they used, and that was based on the estimated 17 construction costs in the state. So I don't think that 18 the estimated number of construction spreads factored 19 into the bonds in Keystone XL, TransCanada I, or what 20 staff factored in for our proposed bond --21 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. So you don't believe that the number of spreads that are being done 22 2.3 simultaneously should be concerning? It's taken care of? 24 I don't mean to speak for you, but it sounds

like you're saying that based upon the cost of the

25

1 project should factor in the number of spreads anyway. 2 MR. KEARNEY: Correct. That would be my 3 understanding. 4 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Kearney. 5 Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional questions? 7 I do have several. The first question I've got 8 is for Ms. Baker or Ms. Real Bird on behalf of the Yankton Sioux Tribe. 10 I need to burrow into -- just a little bit 11 further into your claim of the aboriginal tribal rights 12 of the Yankton Sioux Tribe, particularly the concern or 13 the claim of the right to gather plants from within your 14 aboriginal territory. 15 And so am I understanding your argument 16 correctly that the Yankton Sioux Tribe has an absolute 17 right within their aboriginal territory to gather plants 18 on private property? Is that correct? 19 MR. REAL BIRD: If you'll just bear with us a 20 second, Mr. Chairman, we're going to pull up our Brief 21 really quickly. 22 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. 2.3 MS. REAL BIRD: Thank you. 24 MS. BAKER: Thank you, Commissioner, Chairman. 25 While there's not an absolute right on private lands for such aboriginal rights and gathering, there is a history that continues of tribal members working cooperatively with landowners, having amicable relationships, and exercising those rights on their property to maintain cultural practices and traditions.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I appreciate that response.

Really that would be no different than myself as a nontribal member if I saw some particular plant or flower on somebody else's property, I could ask them for permission to gather that; correct?

MS. BAKER: I understand what you're saying, but it is still tied to that aboriginal right and that aboriginal land claim.

And landowners don't generally allow the public to access their land and utilize their resources in such a way, but because of tribal members' attachments to land, historical ties and ancestral ties, they are able to establish those relationships and exercise those rights.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And you've expressed in your Brief considerable concern about the fact that the pipeline would prevent tribal members from gathering plants apparently as they have in the past.

And so share with me exactly on the proposed pipeline route where tribal members currently have

1 permission to gather plants. 2 MS. BAKER: I believe Faith Spotted Eagle did 3 testify to this and spoke that it's all along the James River where it's crossed there. 4 5 There may have been another crossing as well. 6 But particularly the James River. 7 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. 8 The next question I have is for Mr. Boomsma. And I don't see Mr. Boomsma. 10 Mr. Boomsma, are you on the telephone or anyone 11 representing the Stofferahn family? 12 Apparently that question will go unanswered. 13 Certainly questions for Dakota Access, whoever 14 wants to -- and these are to clear up some loose ends. 15 The first question deals with an e-mail that we 16 received, and I think this would have been under the 17 form of commentary to the Commission from a 18 Linda Dansman-Nichols. The e-mail was dated October 9. 19 She's claiming to be a landowner in Minnehaha County, 20 claims that the proposed pipeline route is within 21 300 feet of her home but that she was never given the 22 proper notification. She indicated she had talked to Ms. Edwards 2.3 24 about this, and what I need to know is has anybody

clarified whether her claim is accurate or not or where

25

this situation resides?

2.3

And, Ms. Edwards, if you can cast any light on it, I just need to know whether she's received proper notice or not.

MS. EDWARDS: This is Kristen Edwards for staff. Deb Gregg has made several contacts with

Ms. Dansman-Nichols since the Commission hearing mostly because one of the other witnesses named her as somebody staff hadn't called back. And she assured Deb Gregg that she did receive a phone call back from staff. And, in fact, it wasn't the PUC that she was concerned with not receiving contact back from. So I'd like to just clarify that.

We have spoken a lot to her and have determined that she does own land within I'd say about 300 feet of the pipeline. She owns the acreage. Her father owns the farmland. Her father was given notice. I'm not sure that she was. But she was aware of the hearing and couldn't go because she had a prior commitment that night.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: So I'm going to ask

Mr. Koenecke representing DAPL, is it correct that she,
in fact, did not receive the proper legal notice?

MR. KOENECKE: I wouldn't say that it's not

correct that she didn't receive the proper legal notice,

but that's a bigger question with a longer answer so let's dive into that. We're good with that.

2.3

We've determined that Linda Nichols' name was not on the list, and we did not send service out to her last December. She is the owner of an inholding or an acreage, I believe Ms. Edwards put it, within a quarter section or a parcel that belongs to her father Henry Dansman. He did get notice.

We have a long history of contacts with both the father and the daughter dating to before the application's filing and afterwards. But she was not on the list, and we did not mail her. That is accurate. We did not determine that until well into the process.

I can't give you as I sit here an actual month or date in time, but it was well after the January hearings when this was brought to light.

And so it was well prior to, if I recall correctly, the September hearings. So there is a -- I think the question then becomes what's the effect of that. I think that's where Commissioner Nelson is going with this.

I don't view it as being jurisdictional. If it was jurisdictional that we have everybody served, we would send the sheriff out to serve people with notice of the proceedings, of the Commission's proceedings.

We don't send notice to all of the landowners who might be named on a particular parcel. We had the statute changed, the Commission did some years back, to provide that we send it to the taxpayer of record. And so that's the first name listed on the parcel.

2.3

I don't know as I sit here whether Mrs. Nichols is the first name or what have you on the inholding regardless of the fact nothing was sent to that address.

But I don't think you can view the notion that we send out notice to everybody within a half-mile and we publish and the Commission publishes as being anything more than a requirement that we get out to affected people in a substantial fashion.

We didn't try to skip Mrs. Nichols. I want to make that, you know, abundantly clear. We did send out more than 2,000 pieces of mail on this. There's a lot of mail that goes out on these things.

And so in closing I would just want -- it would not be our position that it's jurisdictional, that somehow it voids the process. She had actual notice of the proceedings. She didn't get the single piece of notice to which she was entitled under state law, but she did have actual notice in my view from my conversation with her and from my conversations with other people who have spoken with her.

It's unfortunate. We shouldn't have mistakes like that. I don't want to whitewash at all. We tried very hard to send out the notices that were required. But when you look at it, we do publish. And if publishing was not enough in the legislature's view, we -- if mailing wasn't enough, we also publish.

2.3

There's no requirement that people pick up the mail, for example. They don't have to do that, and in a lot of cases they don't. We get a lot of cards back every time we have a siting filing that people just don't bother to pick it up. And that's why in, say, civil jurisdiction in the courts somebody's served and you get a return of service back from the sheriff's deputy saying I served Commissioner Nelson at his residence at 7:12 p.m. by leaving it with him, and I identified it.

So there are different nuances, I should say, to the manner in which we get notice out of these proceedings. And I think they were substantially followed, and we regret that we have apparently one person who did not get the notice.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. I appreciate your taking the time to explain that.

Obviously, my concern, and I'm guessing my fellow Commissioners share this, is making sure the rights of landowners in South Dakota are protected

through this process.

2.3

So, Ms. Edwards, do you agree with the contention that missing one mailing out of perhaps 2,000 would not be fatal to this process?

MS. EDWARDS: I absolutely do. And the reasoning is there's redundancy built into the statute for that reason. I know Leah Mohr downstairs worked very, very hard to get notice in every paper as required by statute. The company put notice in. And my opinion would be the redundancy is for that reason.

Because when you have over 2,000 landowners you need to be careful, and you need to make sure everybody has notice. And we have discussed it with Ms. Dansman-Nichols, and she did have constructive notice.

She knew about the public hearing, and she was unable to attend unfortunately. But like everyone else, she's able to submit her comments at any time if she missed that meeting.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. I appreciate that response.

The next issue I'd like to follow up on is an e-mail we received again through commentary on October 27 from John Wellnitz. Apparently the pipeline is scheduled to cross his property, and he's alleging that one of the

1 valve placements is in the middle or close to the middle 2 of his farm field, making it pretty awkward for farming. And so I'm wondering is that correct? 3 4 secondly, it looks to me on a map like it could be moved 5 maybe a quarter of a mile and put in a fence line instead 6 of in the middle of his field. 7 Can you comment on that issue at all? 8 MR. KOENECKE: I'm still calling up the e-mail on my device here. 10 CHAIRMAN NELSON: If I'm understanding his 11 e-mail correctly and the map that I'm looking at, apparently the valve placement's at milepost 370 and a 12 13 half, which is pretty close to the center of his field. 14 MR. KOENECKE: Commissioner, do you know or did 15 you make note of which map page that is on? I'm looking 16 at his attachment to his e-mail of October 28. 17 CHAIRMAN NELSON: I don't. Because when I'm --18 MR. KOENECKE: Would you repeat the milepost for me then? 19 370.5. 20 CHAIRMAN NELSON: 21 MS. EDWARDS: Commissioner Nelson, if it helps, I did e-mail Deb Gregg and ask her to maybe run upstairs. 22 2.3 She talks to a lot of these same people, and she's very 24 familiar with their concerns. And I know we've spoken to 25 him.

1 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yeah. That might be helpful. 2 MS. STOFFERAHN: Hello. This is Chairman Nelson. 3 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Is 4 this Ms. Stofferahn? 5 MS. STOFFERAHN: Yes, it is. 6 CHAIRMAN NELSON: If you'd just hang on, I'm in 7 the middle of a series of questions with Dakota Access, 8 and then we will get to you. MS. STOFFERAHN: Sure. That's fine. 10 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. 11 MR. KOENECKE: We're taking a minute to read 12 what Mr. Wellnitz --13 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Absolutely. 14 MR. MAHMOUD: So are you suggesting that we move 15 the valve to the edge of his field, and is this guy willing to do that? Because if he is, that's an obvious 16 17 yes. 18 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yeah. That's what -- if I'm 19 understanding his e-mail correctly, he's got a great 20 concern with having this valve plopped in the middle of 21 his field, which I would also if I were in his shoes. 22 It looks to me like it could be fairly easily 2.3 moved to the fence line. That might be a quarter of a 24 mile move. And I don't know how much flexibility you've 25 got in that valve placement, but I think we need to work

with him to make sure that we don't have an obstruction 2 in the middle of his field that doesn't absolutely need to be. 3 4 MR. MAHMOUD: We can work with that. And a 5 quarter mile in this circumstance, looking at that map, 6 there's a stream nearby that we need to protect. 7 CHAIRMAN NELSON: And that's a trade-off, isn't 8 it? MR. MAHMOUD: It is. So the further the 10 distance is, the more crude that sits in the pipe. 11 as far as flexibility, if that helps this gentleman close that tract out, we don't have a problem doing that. 12 13 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, if, in fact, the permit 14 is granted, that would be an expectation that you would 15 go back and have a serious conversation with him and work 16 together on getting that issue resolved? 17 MR. MAHMOUD: Yes, sir. 18 CHAIRMAN NELSON: The last question I think I've 19 got for you at the moment deals with the pump station 20 location. And am I looking correctly? 21 Is there a residence across the road and just 22 maybe less than a quarter mile to the west of the pump 2.3 station location? 24 MR. MAHMOUD: We're going to pull it up to make, sure but that sounds about right. It's either -- there's 25

one landowner that's near. I can't remember if that's his barn or his home. So let us pull up the map real quick.

2.3

Do you have a map reference by any chance?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: You know, I zoomed it in and took a clip of that so, no, I don't have the whole thing.

The pump station, if I had to guess, I'd say

34 maybe.

MR. MAHMOUD: Yeah. From what -- we're trying to pull it up, but if I remember the situation, and I'm pretty sure this is right, the structure you're looking at is his farmstead. But his actual house is more than a mile away.

And so when we bought that property -- we actually have dealt with the landowner quite a bit to purchase that piece of property. And I think he was concerned about a visual barrier as well, if I'm -- I'm trying to remember the comments that had come up at that time.

And where we purchased and we placed the pump station was actually in coordination with him. So when we started to receive those comments we were a little bit surprised. But the area closest to the pump station is not where he lives. He actually lives further to the west.

```
1
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Is there anybody living on
2
     that location?
              MR. MAHMOUD: Not that we are aware of.
 3
 4
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Go ahead, Commissioner
5
    Sattgast.
 6
              ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: I'm trying to
7
     recall. During some of the testimony you said what the
     decibel level was of the pump station.
8
              Do you remember what that was?
10
              MR. MAHMOUD: It would be no more than 55 DBH at
11
    the edge of the fence line. So that's equivalent to --
12
              ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: Common
13
    conversation, if I recall.
14
              MR. MAHMOUD: A lawn mower is 85. So as a point
15
    of reference.
16
              ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: Okay.
                                                    Thank you.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: So I want to follow up on
17
18
           In the Stipulated Conditions that you've worked
19
     out with staff, you established the 55 dB at the nearest
20
     occupied residence, not at a fence line.
21
              MR. MAHMOUD: So we based our -- that's a
22
     federal standard, by the way. 55 DBH at the nearest
2.3
    noise sensitive receptor.
2.4
              Our designs, we're 55 decibels at the edge of
25
     our property just to avoid any issues. If you want to
```

put that as our stipulated condition, we're okay with that. Because I know we're going to do that.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I guess my overall concern, I just want to make sure if, in fact, there was somebody living at that location, that they were aware of the 55 level and didn't have any concern with it. If there's nobody living there, then it's a nonissue.

MR. MAHMOUD: And he's very well-aware, by the way. He was part of, again, the selling of the property to us and was made aware of what the decibel readings were going to be.

And our design engineer has personally met with this gentleman who owns that residence as well as the barn to go over the details of the design at that location. So we have met with him. He's aware.

Now I don't know if you would -- if it all sunk in. I would admit that these are technical design issues that sometimes don't mean a lot to nonengineer types.

But we have certainly made an attempt to make sure that he's aware of the limitations.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Ms. Edwards, have we heard anything from that landowner in regard to the noise issue at all?

MS. EDWARDS: No. I don't believe I have. Oh, maybe --

We received a question about the visual impact, but I don't think I've ever received a question about the noise.

2.3

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. I think that's all the questions I've got. I'm sensitive to the noise issue, but apparently nobody else is or at least the person that owns the property isn't. So I think that's all that I need to go down that track.

That's all I have for you gentlemen, at least at the moment.

My understanding -- Nancy Stofferahn, are you on the line?

MS. STOFFERAHN: Yes, I am. And also my husband, Tom Stofferahn, is on the line also.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Excellent. I appreciate you joining us. We're asking a series of kind of clarifying questions.

At the -- towards the end of our hearing, evidentiary hearing, Mr. Mahmoud was on the stand, and I don't believe you were in the room. I don't know if you were listening online. And I asked him some clarifying questions about your situation.

I'm very sensitive to the fact that you don't want a pipeline where you want to put your test plots, and that location makes to me perfect sense for your test

plots and demonstration plots.

2.3

His response was that, you know, they are willing to negotiate that if you all are willing to come to the table to negotiate that location.

And so my question is very simple. Have you entered into a negotiation with DAPL for the location of that pipeline and an easement?

MS. STOFFERAHN: Well, they served a subpoena to take our land three weeks ago so we're back in lawsuit, I guess. No, we have not negotiated. They have not contacted us regarding negotiations, to my knowledge, us personally.

Our attorney is not on the line. I don't know if they've contacted him or not about us.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And you have not contacted them about negotiating around the area that you'd like to put your test plot?

MS. STOFFERAHN: I guess since we were sued again, no, we have not called them. You know, I guess as far as our addition, you know, they knew about that October of 2014. I told their employee who came who wanted my husband to sign a survey release, and I asked her where the pipeline was going and she said, well, it's coming down behind your house and behind that white building over there.

```
1
              And I said, well, on that white building, that's
2
     our business. We have expansion plans. And I was
     telling her about it and stuff. And she just said so.
 3
 4
              You know, that was before they even asked for a
5
    permit.
 6
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Right. But I'm talking
    about after --
7
8
              MS. STOFFERAHN: Since the hearing? Is that
    what you're saying?
10
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Since Mr. Mahmoud at the
11
    hearing indicated a willingness to negotiate with you
12
    over the location. That's the time period I'm asking
13
    about.
14
              MS. STOFFERAHN: I have not -- we have not
15
    received a call from Dakota Access since the hearing
16
    personally here at our residence or our business, and to
17
    my knowledge I don't think they've contacted Mr. Boomsma,
18
    to my knowledge.
19
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I understand that you have
20
    not contacted them either.
21
              MS. STOFFERAHN: No, I have not.
22
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay.
2.3
              MS. STOFFERAHN: We were served, I think, on
2.4
    November 9.
25
                                Thank you.
                                            That is all the
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
```

questions I have from you. And, again, I appreciate you calling in so we can clarify where that was at.

2.3

MS. STOFFERAHN: Okay. No problem. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Ms. Edwards, just a couple of questions. We had a lot of discussion about the parent company liability documents, and those documents were filed.

My question for you is have you analyzed those, and have you found those to be legally adequate, binding, covering the situation that needs to be covered?

Can you talk to us about what you've found in those?

MS. EDWARDS: I did look through them thoroughly, and I was satisfied with them. And I know the -- I remember there being a lot of questions about them from the Iowa Commission too in the last week. So there's obviously been a lot of interest in that, and I feel like they do cover legally the obligations of the company.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

The last question I think I've got for you, in the Stipulation, Stipulated Conditions, and I won't go into the individual paragraphs unless we need to, but I find the term "emergency response plan." I find the term "facility emergency response plan." I find the term

"facility response plan." 1 2 Are those all three the same? 3 MS. EDWARDS: They are. 4 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Would you have any objection 5 to utilizing the same term for those throughout the 6 document? And if so, which would be appropriate? 7 MS. EDWARDS: I would not have an objection to 8 that, and I believe the appropriate one would be emergency response plan. 10 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Mahmoud, would you care to 11 come to the microphone and give the company's 12 perspective. I didn't intend to open the can of worms, 13 but I'm uncomfortable using different terminology unless 14 there's a reason. 15 MR. MAHMOUD: Yeah. And we apologize for having 16 multiple references to the same documents. 17 Our nomenclature is actually facility response 18 That's the technical title of the plan. We use plan. 19 emergency response plan and facilities just as kind of --20 I don't know what the right word is, but the technical, 21 correct is facility response plan. 22 And I hate to not have gone over that with you, 2.3 Kristen. We should have cleared that up. 2.4 CHAIRMAN NELSON: That's fine. I appreciate 25 both perspectives. And here's the deal. If we choose to

```
1
     move forward, the Commission gets to decide. So I
     appreciate the input from both of you.
2
              That, I think, is all the questions that I've
 3
 4
     got.
5
              Any other Commissioner questions?
              Commissioner Hanson.
 6
7
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Troy Larson
8
     gave testimony for Lewis & Clark and for the South Dakota
     Rural Water Association. And it's my understanding that
10
     there is going to be stipulations agreed to between the
11
     Applicant and the rural water systems.
12
              Can you tell us if there's been an agreement
13
    made there?
14
              MR. MAHMOUD: Yes, sir. There has. We've
15
     executed the agreement and -- as of last week, maybe the
16
     week before, but it's complete.
17
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you very much.
18
              MR. MAHMOUD: You bet.
19
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.
20
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional Commissioner
21
     questions?
22
              If not, at this point I would open the floor for
2.3
    motions.
24
              And at this time I will move to grant the permit
25
     to Dakota Access with the conditions that have been
```

stipulated between Dakota Access and the PUC staff.

Discussion on the motion.

2.3

I'm going to take an opportunity for discussion.

And I apologize to everyone. You might find this lengthy but this has been a lengthy process and I think this is important.

The first thing is that it may be a little bit unusual, but in addition to the motion that I've made, I'm going to be offering several amendments to my own motion. The reason that I'm doing that separately, I want to make sure that those amendments have a very fair examination, that my fellow Commissioners have an opportunity to thumbs up or thumbs down on individual amendments.

And I will say at the outset that those amendments go beyond the Stipulated Conditions, and you all in the audience will have an opportunity to view those when we get to that point.

I want to spend just a little bit of time talking about how I've arrived at my decision to make the motion that I did. And we certainly -- none of the three of us take this lightly, and certainly I don't. This has been a long process with a lot of input, a lot of very passionate input, and I appreciate that.

I want to speak, first of all, to the landowners

that are affected. And I don't see them in the room, but I know that a lot of them are probably listening online. And perhaps the most important thing I can say to the landowners is that your story, the story you have told us, is my story.

2.3

You've given us testimony on the importance of family farms, of the generational history of those farms, of your commitment to preserving land for the future and, frankly, your simple love for the land. Your story is my story. I share that. I share your background.

I intimately understand what these landowners have said about the importance of their property. And I say that in a way that I think folks that don't grow up in rural South Dakota probably don't fully appreciate.

And I've asked myself 100 times as we have gone through this process how would I feel if I was the one receiving the notice from Dakota Access saying they wanted to put a pipeline across my beloved portion of South Dakota farmland. And, frankly, I'd say to the landowners, I wouldn't be any happier than any of you all are or have been at this point.

But that said and with that understanding, as a PUC Commissioner, I am bound to adjudicate and make my decisions in this case based upon the laws of the State of South Dakota and the facts and the evidence that have

been presented in this case, and that's how I will make my decision.

2.3

And, quite simply, I find that throughout this process Dakota Access has demonstrated that they have a legal right to have this permit issued to them.

The most important thing I'm going to say today is this: If my motion passes and this pipeline is constructed, it is an imperative and a nonnegotiable that construction and reclamation be conducted in a manner that allows our farmers and ranchers to very quickly get back to their business of producing food for the world uninhibited by this pipeline and so that the Applicant can conduct their business of delivering petroleum products for our country.

Let's turn to the Applicant's burden of proof, laid out for us in state law 49-41B-22. And so that the public listening thoroughly understands, the decision that we have to make is not based on the whim or the will of PUC Commissioners. It's based on the standard laid out by our State Legislature, and that standard is, number one, that the proposed facility will comply with all applicable laws and rules; number two, the facility will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment, nor to the social and economic condition of inhabitants or expected inhabitants of the siting area;

number three, the facility will not substantially impair the health, safety, or welfare of the inhabitants; and, number four, the facility will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region, with due consideration having been given to the views of governing bodies of affected local units of government.

That's the standard.

2.3

I want to spend a little bit of time talking about some of the individual issues that have arisen in this docket that I feel I need to address. And the first is the issue of the pipeline route through potential growth areas. And that is an obvious concern given the statutory criteria that I've just talked about.

And so one of the first questions that I raised or asked was does this pipeline go through any of the "neighboring growth areas" that are designated by local municipalities as their areas of growth?

And I questioned Mr. Mahmoud at length over that as we looked at the exact routing, particularly in the area south of Harrisburg. And his testimony confirmed that the map that had been filed by the City of Sioux Falls as Exhibit A showed the correct current routing of the pipeline and that that follows along the edge of a neighboring growth area.

I think it's critical to note that the cities

located close to this pipeline and the counties through which it traverses could have easily intervened and put on the record any concerns they may have had about the routing of the pipeline. Goodness knows it's pretty easy to become an Intervenor in one of these cases.

2.3

And while the City of Sioux Falls and Lincoln

County did intervene, the others did not. And even the

City of Sioux Falls, their sole concern was how does this

affect their landfill, and they were, through

negotiation, able to resolve their routing concern.

That's it. Nothing else. An absolute silence from the

other governing bodies in that particular area.

There was some testimony or suggestion that this pipeline should have been routed further to the west and further to the south of the Sioux Falls area.

Understand -- it's very important for folks to understand the PUC does not have routing authority. We cannot sit here today and say move it here or move it there. We cannot and do not have the statutory authority to make route amendments.

And even if we did, being asked to pick one
South Dakota landowner over another South Dakota
landowner is a path that I would not want to go down and
would not go down. Picking and choosing between which
landowner should be affected and which one gets out of

being affected is not something that this Commission should ever be involved in.

2.3

I want to spend a moment talking about some of the discussion about the development potential of properties that are going to be crossed. And I think that discussion needs to start again with a reminder of the three words that I emphasized in the statutory criteria: Serious, substantial, and unduly. That's the standard we have to live by, and I did not find in any of the testimony that the concerns rose to that level.

As that argument was being made, and it's one I listened to carefully, I was looking for independent testimony documenting quantitatively what the economic impact might be to property crossed by the pipeline. I didn't hear any of that testimony.

I heard conclusory testimony from landowners about how they perceive the value of their property might be affected and how the development potential might be impacted. And that's testimony that's hard to ignore. I can't ignore it. But, by the same token, I didn't find that independent quantitative testimony that I feel would have been needed.

There was also testimony that development would not be possible on the parcels crossed by the pipeline.

And I think that claim was clearly contradicted when DAPL

filed their Exhibits 51 and 52, the maps showing existing petroleum pipelines in the Sioux Falls area. In fact, I noted that one of those pipelines is just feet from the apartment building where my mother lives. And I've been in that area hundreds of times, and I've always admired the green space that is created along that pipeline right of way.

2.3

And my observation is that that pipeline didn't stop any development. Did it require development to be planned around it? Absolutely, which left a rather attractive green space through that particular neighborhood.

And so then the question we're left with, does whatever impact there might be on development potential, does it violate the statutory criteria of serious, substantial, and unduly? I don't think so.

I want to spend a minute talking about the accuracy of the property tax estimates. If anybody sat through the hearing, you probably got the impression this was a big deal to me. I want to explain why I think it's so important.

When we look at what does this pipeline bring to South Dakota, it certainly brings some jobs. It brings some initial payments to landowners. But really the only long-term impact to South Dakota is the property taxes

the company is going to pay. And that's why it's important -- as I look at it, it's really what do the people of South Dakota get for hosting this pipeline.

2.3

And to answer that question, it really comes down to what kind of property taxes are going to be paid to support our schools and our counties and township governments.

I think the people of South Dakota deserve to know that answer ahead of time. And that's why I spent so much time diving into the minutia of property taxation with the representatives from the Revenue Department that testified.

And, as we all know, the Department of Revenue refuses to provide an estimate because, as they indicated, they don't have the input assumptions necessary to do so, nor would they know the reliability of the assumptions if, in fact, they had been provided to them. So they simply can't.

My wish, if I could wish something here, it would have been that the Applicant would have provided to the Department of Revenue documented assumptions and that I could require the Department of Revenue to take those assumptions and give us their estimate.

I don't have the authority to do that. The Legislature simply has not given us the authority for us

to tell the Department of Revenue to do anything. And so I can't.

2.3

And so what are we left with in this area? We are left with the DAPL application that states in the first full year of operation property taxes will be approximately 14 million. We have during the hearing received assurances from DAPL that they verified their methodology of calculation through several phone calls with the Department of Revenue.

Am I completely comfortable with all of that?

The answer is no. But I think, given the limits that we have on our authority, that's as close as we're going to get to an estimate.

And I will just say this: The public policy question of whether the methodology used to establish the taxation level on Interstate pipelines, if that -- is that methodology proper? That's a question that we can't resolve. That's, again, a legislative question and not within our purview.

Eminent domain. I want to address this only because we've heard so many comments about this that have come into the docket. And let me make it very, very clear, the Public Utilities Commission is not involved in easement negotiations, and we are not involved in eminent domain decisions. That is outside of our purview. The

Legislature has not directed us to become involved in that.

2.3

2.4

There are some states where the PUCs are involved in those decisions, and that may be where some of the confusion comes in from folks thinking that we can make those decisions. But we can't. Eminent domain laws are established by the Legislature and the Governor.

This docket is the forum for discussing -- I should say this docket is not the forum for discussing whether our State's eminent domain law properly balances property owner rights with the interests of project developers. That is squarely a prerogative of the Legislature.

And my last point: Reclamation. As I began saying, I understand the love that a farmer or rancher has for his or her land. I get that more intimately than anything else I do here. Reclamation is what returns the property back to its original state or as close as humanly possible.

And I will say as a landowner I've lived through reclamation of a large scale project on my property. And I've got experience where part of that was a grand success, and part of it was not. I've seen both ends of that.

It is crucial that we do this right so that our

farmers and ranchers can get back to doing what they do best, producing food for the world.

2.3

2.4

Proper reclamation starts with, number one, doing the project correctly in the first place. Proper stripping of topsoil, proper decompaction, or even better yet, operating in a manner that decompaction is not even needed, proper tile repair, proper grass reestablishment. All of these are imperatives and nonnegotiables with me.

The Stipulated Conditions -- and I want to say thank you to the company and the PUC staff for working through and coming up with the Stipulated Conditions. As I was approaching this meeting, in my mind I'm wondering how do we get our hands around what the proper conditions ought to be. And your Stipulated Conditions are a good starting point toward accomplishing the goal of proper reclamation.

The acknowledgment by DAPL that a third-party monitor can play a valuable role in the process is commendable. I say that to you because I got the impression during the hearing you might not have had that perspective. And I'd also say this is, as a PUC, our first experience with this. And so we will no doubt be learning some things as we utilize the third-party monitor.

But if this is the step that is necessary to

eliminate the potential for problems like we heard from the Sibsons and Mr. Moeckly, then I think it's worth giving it a try to make sure we get things done. And it's important I think for folks out there in the public to know that that monitor is going to be paid for by DAPL and not the taxpayers of South Dakota. We're not on the hook for that.

2.3

2.4

And while I've said that the Stipulated

Conditions are a good start, I've got two amendments that

I'm going to offer to those that I believe will provide

even greater protection for the people of the State of

South Dakota and particularly the affected landowners.

The First Amendment is a package, 17-page package, of possible amendments that have been provided to the Commissioners by Commission counsel for us to consider.

I'm just trying to figure out one thing. I plan to make a substitute motion to deny. And I'm trying to figure out whether we should go through all of those conditions prior to that motion or if we should -- if it would make sense to do that. The decision of the Commission as to how we wish to proceed.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think we can do it either way.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Let's proceed with that then, and then we'll have those taken care of.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Perfect.

2.3

2.4

And so at this time I would move what I'm just going to call the comprehensive 17-page amendment of possible amendments. And what I would recommend -- I think we've got copies of the 17 pages. I would -- what I think we will do -- the way that I would like to proceed with this is to move into recess. Because what I'd like to do is allow all of the parties an opportunity to review these amendments.

And this is a little bit unusual. And if either of the Commissioners are uncomfortable with this, let me know. But what I'd like to do is move into recess, let everybody have an opportunity to review these amendments. When we come out of recess I would specifically like to hear if there are any of these amendments that are either impossible, unworkable, or simply not applicable to this project.

I want to make sure that from everyone's perspective we're not making any errors with this particular package. And then we'll take that input and move on from there.

Commissioner Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Just to try to -- with all

```
1
     the notes that we have on this, the 17 pages of
2
     amendments, are those consistent with -- and I -- I'm
 3
     trying to phrase this properly because we do not discuss
 4
     this between ourselves prior to this, and we do share the
     same counsel but that counsel does not share what each
 5
 6
     one of us is thinking.
7
              So I'm trying to -- are these similar to --
8
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                If I might, Commissioner.
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: You're anticipating what
10
     I'm asking?
11
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yes.
                                      These are exactly what
12
     Commission counsel has provided to each of the three of
13
     us independently.
14
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Assuming that she
15
     presented the same thing to each of us.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Knowing her, I can assure you
16
17
     that is the case.
18
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Okav.
19
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: I specifically then will have
20
     a second set of amendments that you have not seen. And I
21
     do it that way simply to keep it clean.
22
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Thank you. And I will
2.3
     have some minor adjustments as well to that.
2.4
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I want to -- just for your
25
     information, on page 7 under 16B, Sub A where there's the
```

```
word "approve" it should be approved with a D. That's
1
2
     the only change that I would make to this amendment from
 3
     what was presented.
 4
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay. I saw that as well
5
     too. However, I changed the font so my pages were
 6
     different.
7
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: So I would move that
8
     amendment.
              Discussion on the amendment.
10
              At this time I would move that we take a
11
     15-minute recess.
12
              Discussion on the motion to recess?
13
              Hearing none, all of those in favor of the
14
     motion to recess will say aye; those opposed nay.
15
              Commissioner Hanson.
16
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Aye.
17
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Sattgast.
              ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: Aye.
18
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye.
19
              We are in a 15-minute recess. We'll come back
20
     at a quarter to 3:00.
21
22
                      (A short recess is taken)
2.3
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: We will call the PUC meeting
24
     back to order. We have an amendment on the floor. And
25
     while this is highly unusual for us to open the floor to
```

comment on amendments, I think because of the length of these and the importance, I'd like to open it up.

And I'd specifically like to know if there are any of these amendments that are either impossible, highly impractical, or simply not applicable to this particular project.

And if the answer is none, that would be great.

Mr. Koenecke.

2.3

MR. KOENECKE: Thank you, Commissioner.

We reviewed these in the time the Commission gave us, and we thank you for that. We found that there are two places in which we'd like to clarify the document. They're both on page 7.

If we go down to 16B, Sub H, I can't think of a place in my review of the project where there would be timber or slash available to support an equipment crossing of wetlands. We use timber mats, which are timbers of substantial mass, such as they support heavy equipment.

I think what you meant there is raw timber. And so if that is what you were thinking, raw timber and slash to support equipment crossings, then we're onboard. If it's to deny us the use of timber mats, which are I think critical to the process, then we've got a problem.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I would happily insert the

```
"raw" in front of the word "timber." Yes.
1
2
              MR. KOENECKE: Okay. Very good. We thought
 3
     that was probably the case.
 4
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Excuse me.
                                                 Instead of the
5
    page number, excuse me, could you give me the reference,
     like 16A or --
 6
7
              MR. KOENECKE: Yes, Commissioner. I'd be glad
8
     to.
         16B, Sub H.
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Thank vou.
10
              MR. KOENECKE: You're welcome.
11
              I might let Mr. Mahmoud talk about the next one.
12
     I think he's got it more clearly in his head than I do.
13
              MR. MAHMOUD: The next one is 16B, subset I,
14
     subject to Condition 35. And where I'm referencing is
15
     the second line where it says 25 feet.
16
              In Condition 35 the width is 30 feet. So we
17
    would just like to make that consistent. 30 feet is the
18
    width that we maintain the right of way for visual
19
     observations during aerial flights, which is a pretty
20
     important width for us from a safety perspective to be
21
     able to visually observe the right of way.
22
              And we were just asking for those two to be
2.3
     consistent.
2.4
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: I would be fine with a
25
     friendly amendment to Sub I to change that to 30 feet.
```

1 MR. MAHMOUD: Thank you. That's all we have. 2 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Are there any others that 3 would like to comment on the proposed amendments? 4 Seeing none, discussion on the proposed 5 amendment. 6 I will simply say I appreciate Commission 7 counsel going to the work of identifying these additional 8 provisions that I believe are additional protections, particularly for the landowners of South Dakota as this 10 is constructed. I think these are good additions. I 11 appreciate the company taking a look at these and helping 12 us make two corrections. 13 Beyond that, I think that's all I've got to say. 14 Additional discussion. 15 COMMISSIONER HANSON: And it's your intent to 16 have subsequent amendments to this? 17 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Correct. 18 COMMISSIONER HANSON: And I would agree with 19 you. Commission counsel is a real talent. She's done a 20 fantastic job here. 21 CHAIRMAN NELSON: With that, no further 22 discussion. 2.3 All those in favor of amending the main motion 24 by adding these amendments will vote aye; those opposed 25 nay.

1 Commissioner Sattgast.

2.3

2 ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: Aye.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And Nelson votes aye. The motion is amended.

We are at the point of further discussion of the main motion as amended, and I would at this time like to offer a second set of amendments that I am going to call the Nelson amendments in green.

Since we're getting a lot of colors here, these are going to be amendments in green. And I believe that these are additional amendments that are necessary to protect the landowners along the route, and a number of these are things that we've talked about throughout this process.

At this point nobody has a copy of these, but I've got the copies here. And so what I'm going to do is distribute -- and this is a four-pager. It's not going to be placed up online, but I intend to go through these one at a time so everyone who is listening online will have adequate opportunity to find out what we're up to.

And anybody out there that wants -Mr. Koenecke, if you'd just be so kind as to pass these
out to whoever out in the audience might like one.

At this time I would move to amend the main motion with the Nelson amendments in green.

2.3

Discussion on the proposed amendment.

If I might just go through these one at a time. What you will see here, whatever is in red is what we just approved in the last amendment. Okay. What you see in green is what I am proposing to change.

And so for my fellow Commissioners it's the green that you should focus on.

On the top of the first page in Sub 16 I'm asking to add a phrase, "a written explanation of the option for complete topsoil segregation."

I think it's important. Because we've spent a lot of time talking about this. The company has agreed to do this. I think it's extremely important that the landowners be provided that in writing so that there's no question in hindsight, I didn't know.

I think they need to know. And I know it's already included in here that they be told that verbally. I think it's important that that be provided in writing.

The bottom of page 2, top of page 3. I've over struck the word "commodity or row crops" and inserted the word "cropland." Frankly, commodity or row crops does not make a bit of sense in that context. Cropland I think is the intention and is simply the proper wording.

On page 3 and for those listening online this would be in Condition 24, Sub B. I am proposing that we remove the clarification saying that -- that says "except for periods when it is infeasible to do so" and then removing the last sentence of Sub B.

2.3

Folks need to have access to their house. I mean, that's just a basic -- and you might have to figure out some creative ways of getting people into their house, but I don't think there ought to be an exception for people being able to get into their own house.

And on the last page this would be in Condition 29, Sub E. And this is talking about the length of time that the third-party monitor is going to be employed. And I'm not sure I understood what was in the stipulation about it not including any part of the restoration activities.

And so the language that I've put in here is that that person would be employed to the end of the conclusion of initial reclamation activities.

I understand that this person doesn't need to be maintained through the first growing season to see if the grass actually comes up. But I think it's important that they oversee that entire first initial go around of the reclamation. Hopefully there's not a need for the second go around if it's done right the first time. But that's

my intention with that.

2.3

The next is in Condition 39. There's a phrase in there talking about Dakota Access shall work directly with the landowner to determine proper location. I've also included the word "and slope." That's obvious. And then I've added two sentences at the end. "Dakota Access shall be responsible for repairing or replacing all damaged and disturbed drain tile in a manner that maintains the full integrity, function, and original slope of the drain tile. Dakota Access shall be responsible for making additional repairs or replacement should any drain tile cease to function properly because of the pipeline construction or operation."

Obviously we had a lot of concern about drain tile. We had testimony that it's impossible to repair this drain tile. We had testimony that it's very possible to repair the drain tile. I happen to believe that pretty much anything can be repaired given time and effort and I'm willing to give the company the opportunity to do that but I think it's important that we have language this strong to make sure that the job is finished and done correctly and that if --

And there's been concern about the drain tile sagging at some later point. This I think makes it clear that if that happens, that the company is still

responsible for fixing it so that the drain tile continues to work properly.

2.3

And as the sandbags underneath -- between the pipeline and the drain tile were explained to me, I think that eliminates a lot of that concern. But if something goes wrong, the company is still on the hook to make it right for the farmer.

Condition 47. I've added the word "and pasture" in two places. Pasture restoration and any loss beyond three years is just as important as any crop loss and needs to be covered.

And then the last paragraph I've added is dealing with the issue of any parcels that are organic. And what I've said in this is "Dakota Access shall notify landowners in writing of their right to have their parcel maintained for organic farming. If a landowner has established a land parcel as organic, the landowner must notify Dakota Access in writing of such fact prior to the beginning of construction on that parcel. Upon such notification, Dakota Access will be required to maintain the parcel as organic throughout construction, reclamation, and operation."

To me that seems like a reasonable way of notification from both sides and protecting the landowner's right to maintain their parcel as organic, if

it is already in that state. 2 That is the sum of my amendments. Hopefully 3 I've explained them adequately to my fellow Commissioners. And with that, I would ask for support. 4 5 Further discussion on the amendment. 6 Okay. My understanding is that staff actually 7 is going to be posting this out on the website. It may 8 take just a minute for it to get out there. Okay. Counsel has told me that we probably need 10 to take a short recess until that gets posted so we will 11 just be at ease for a moment or two. 12 (A short recess is taken) 13 CHAIRMAN NELSON: I guess I will ask the 14 Applicant, did you see anything in these that are 15 impossible to comply with? 16 MR. KOENECKE: Thanks, Commissioner. 17 walked up here, I thought about the word impossible. 18 CHAIRMAN NELSON: That's my standard. 19 MR. KOENECKE: Question whether that applied, 20 and then the answer to myself is I think it does. 21 We're looking solely at the paragraph on organic farming. As of right now, there's one parcel on the 22 2.3 project that we know of that is certified organic. It 24 belongs to a family from Sioux Falls and is farmed by 25 Charlie Johnson. We have closed an easement with that

landowner as of some time ago.

2.3

We continued to talk about the nature of the organic certification on that parcel with Mr. Johnson in fits and starts, shall I say. My direction is that we are not opposed to talking about organic farming, but the practicalities of the situation need some discussion.

So what we've got here is I don't know that the landowner has established this parcel as organic. I think it's Mr. Johnson, the tenant, and not the landowner. So impossibility, that's kind of where that comes from.

It's Mr. Johnson's certification, I think. I've looked at his certifying agency. It was my understanding that even if we did everything that was asked of us, he would still lose his certification by virtue of the construction on that parcel.

Then we get into questions about even if we did the drop cloths and the not fueling on his -- on that parcel, he was still going to lose the certification is how we understood it from his particular certifying agency. There are numbers of certifying agencies. He happens to use the one, if I recall, from North Dakota.

My understanding, and I'm not an expert in this, is that there are a number of certifying agencies

nationwide which people can use at their own discretion. There are not the kind of clear delineated boundaries to organic certification out there that lend themselves to a right to have the land parcel maintained and for us to maintain the parcel as organic.

I don't think based on my understanding and my reading of this literature from his certifying agency that there's any way to construct and maintain the parcel as organic. And I want to go back to what I've originally said. We've already signed with the landowner on that tract and paid the damages that stemmed from the organic certification.

And I'll let Mr. Mahmoud talk about his thoughts on the subject, but it became clear to us that the route was to pay the organic damages and let the certification sort itself out afterwards.

Because we're talking about constructing a 350-feet-wide permanent easement through a quarter section. So how much of the quarter section then loses its certification based on where the pipe was placed. You see what I'm saying?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

There might be an 80 there or a whole bunch of acreage that still maintains certification, but the right of way doesn't or constructive part. There's all of these permutations and questions out there, and it became 1 clear based on the one instance that the way for us to proceed was to let it work itself out.

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

I'll let Joey talk. I know he's got a number of things to share as well.

MR. MAHMOUD: Thank you. And over all it's not that we're anti the concept. Because the concept makes sense.

The problem we have right now is we're 91.72 percent closed on tracts in the State of South Dakota. And so 92 percent for all practical purposes. So a condition like this where we've gone through and we've negotiated the easements in good faith, we've paid for what we believe to be proper damages for crops or whatever damages to the property -- a condition like this I think unintendedly may drive some folks back to wanting to renegotiate that status, is our fear.

And it's not that we don't -- we do care about organic farming. It's just what standard are we going with for an organic farm?

I know in Minnesota they have a state standard for what an organic farm is. In South Dakota we simply just don't have that. So we're a little bit concerned about what organic farming really even means definitionally. We all know what it means, but what does it really mean in the context of defending that position

either in a court of law, in front of a Commission, in front of anyone? We don't know. And so that opens up kind of Pandora's box that we're trying to stay away from.

2.3

And, secondly, we're down to 8 percent of remaining landowners that none of them to date have claimed to be an organic farmer. So we're putting a condition in place for 8 percent of the landowners where there's no organic farms that are subject to this condition. So we're a little bit concerned that it's going to create something that we really don't want it to create.

And, again, we agree with the concept, and we in practice are actually doing this. The one organic farm we compensated for three years of organic farming loss and loss of that certification to that landowner. It's just the tenant in this case was not happy with his landowner. It's a contractual issue. Nothing that we're involved in.

So that's kind of where when we read this we're like, well, okay, practically we can handle it. Legally we probably cannot, and we don't know where that leaves us. And we don't want to be a naysayer based on your three rule criteria, but at the same time we're kind of stuck.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I appreciate that feedback greatly. A couple of questions:

2.3

So what I understand from you is the certification organization that Mr. Johnson uses, that simply the fact that you've put a pipeline in the ground would negate organic certification?

MR. KOENECKE: I'm going on memory from August, but that was the impression I was left with. When I read the literature from the agency and then compared it with the requests to use drop cloths under all welding and epoxy repair -- use a drop cloth under all of that, don't refuel on the property, don't -- there was two more that don't come to mind.

But if we did all of that, my reading of the literature was we still -- he was still going to be faced with the loss of his certification for the three-year period. They were going to let the same three years go.

And so then we sort of shrugged and said this isn't going to work out. Why would we do all of these things, and you still have the three years?

And then there was the additional question of it's a quarter section, 160 acres, that are owned.

160 rods, you know, is a half-mile. We're using three or four rods for, you know, the long-term right of way and using what would it be? Almost 10. So that leaves the

balance, 150 rods, almost 15/16th of the quarter section unmolested by the pipeline project.

2.3

Well, at that point why would the certification be lost as to that? There were simply more questions than answers every time I opened this up. And we felt like we had adequately addressed with damages to the landowner who owns the property, and they were satisfied. What are we left to do here?

With kind of the quagmire that this might leave us with, and certainly based on the record that's been established in this proceeding thus far I would agree with you that we probably don't have enough information to answer a lot of those questions. I wish we did, but I will readily admit that we probably don't.

Is it your understanding that you put the pipeline in the ground, after three years that there's an opportunity to regain certification for that property?

MR. KOENECKE: Yes. That was absolutely my understanding was that they look at the three years' usage, have you eliminated all of these sources of matter that we don't allow in an organic farm, and once you've certified that to your agency for the three years, they then, you know, grant to you this certification that, yes, your parcel is organic.

And, again, my reading of the literature -- I didn't call anybody and ask. I just looked at what they handed out or what they had on their website. There was no way for us to construct and comply and save the organic certification on that parcel. It seemed to be very arbitrary and very unforgiving as you might expect.

2.3

They want it organic for a reason and it's their reasons and they're going to hold that certification.

The prices of crops from organic farms are substantially in excess of what's found on a farm that's not. So they're not going to hand that out willy-nilly. And I don't think we can comply with this as we sit here today.

I'd have to do some more research and briefing on this, but I don't see how -- I don't think we can construct and maintain the parcel as organic. I think those are mutually exclusive paths.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: If I were to remove this, would it be your understanding that you would certainly work with the landowner in those succeeding years to not apply any herbicides that would purposely extend that three-year period beyond what would be absolutely necessary?

MR. MAHMOUD: Absolutely, we would. And in this particular case we're going to do that. It's just we don't know -- again, absent a South Dakota Law or statute

or some form of definition in the state other than an independent agency for a farm certification, we don't know how to comply with that.

2.3

And I use Minnesota as an example just because they actually passed some organic certification statutes that -- specify how you become a certified organic farmer and what you have to do to maintain that. And the pipelines that you build in that state you actually have to construct with a very prescribed methodology so the farm does not lose its certification.

In this case we don't have those parameters to even know where to start. And the landowner, he essentially could not solve that either and say, well, they wanted the money for the easement so we settled with the landowner who accepted it and then we'll work with him in the future to regain that status as necessary.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I appreciate that. And I also appreciate your highlighting to me the fact that, you know, to an extent this is a contractual issue between the landowner and the renter, and I appreciate your bringing that to light.

The gentleman that testified during the hearing that had the buffalo farm, buffalo pasture, and was hoping to move that towards organic or partially there, can you enlighten me there? Are you working with him to

obtain what he wants?

2.3

MR. KOENECKE: We are unable to work with him. He's represented by counsel. We have not signed an easement, and his counsel, as have others, have directed us not to have contact with him.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

I think that's all the questions I've got. I appreciate that.

I want to turn to staff. Have you all looked into this issue of organic? It wasn't in the Stipulated Conditions. Anything you can help me out with?

MS. EDWARDS: Sure. That was something we took a lot of interest in, and we ran up the flag pole several times just to figure out a way to accomplish that in a legally workable way. And I think the way that Brett has discussed it now is accurate.

And we have had contact with the landowner that he mentioned and we definitely sympathize with his situation and would like to find a way to protect him, but as Brett mentioned, the bottom line is the landowner signed the agreement. So even if a condition went in, would there be anybody to be benefited by it because the landowner's, I assume, already been paid. So it might just be, in the end, padding the pockets of somebody who already signed off and not helping the tenant at all.

1 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. I appreciate that 2 And with that, I will remove my last commentary. 3 paragraph from my proposed amendment. Additional discussion on the amendment. 4 Seeing none, all those in favor of the Nelson 5 6 amendments in green with the exception of that last 7 paragraph will say aye; those opposed nay. 8 Commissioner Sattgast. ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: 10 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Hanson. 11 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. 12 CHAIRMAN NELSON: And Nelson votes aye. The motion is further amended. 13 14 Further discussion on the main motion as 15 amended. 16 Commissioner Hanson. 17 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. I believe this 18 is the opportune time for me to make a motion. And I'm 19 not going to take quite as long to explain my motion as 20 you did yours. I do appreciate your comments, though. 21 Is it all right if I make some comments 22 preceding my motion, or would you prefer that I follow 2.3 the rules of order and make all of them after I make the 2.4 motion? 25 Why don't you go ahead and CHAIRMAN NELSON:

1 make the motion. I think we all understand. That will
2 be fine.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Mr. Chairman, I move that in HP14-002 that to deny the permit because the proposed project does not comply with South Dakota Codified Law 49-41B-22, Applicant's burden of proof.

The Applicant --

COMMISSIONER HANSON:

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And excuse me. Just to clarify, that's a substitute motion; correct?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Which reads the Applicant has the burden of proof to establish that the facility

Correct.

environment nor to the social and economic condition of

16 the inhabitants or expected inhabitants in the siting

will not pose a threat of serious injury to the

area in Subsection 2. And Subsection 4, the facility

will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of

19 the region, with due consideration having been given to

views of governing bodies of affected local units of

21 government.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

22

2.3

24

25

And I would emphasize in Subsection 2 it states expected inhabitants as well, and that cannot be overlooked or emphasized enough.

With very little divergence, the representatives

of all of the parties conducted themselves in a very professional fashion. And they represented their clients admirably. We entertained some extraordinarily brilliant witnesses as well as some not so extraordinarily brilliant witnesses.

2.3

Some of the parties actually presented witnesses that contradicted their own witnesses, and this was on both sides of the fence, so to speak.

I'm very much appreciative of all of our staff for providing excellent, objective questions based upon their independent investigations as well as the several staff members who did such a magnificent job in coordinating the hearings and the entire docket proceedings.

I stated earlier that Rolayne Wiest is a real talent, and she did a terrific job of running the meetings in an impartial and technically skilled manner. None of these comments, of course, are directed towards the motion that I made.

I made the motion because while I agree that pipelines are safer than railroads and safer than trucks, at least that is, I think, provided in evidence and certainly to each one of our own experiences -- however, Dakota Access testified -- let me back up. When I say that I believe that pipelines are safer -- and I do not

intend through this motion to stop Dakota Access from eventually receiving their permit. I simply want it done right.

2.3

Dakota Access testified that the municipalities chose where the municipality wanted the pipeline. This was misleading. Under cross-examination Dakota Access testified that they actually only gave the municipalities different options of where the pipeline route would be located. This was paramount to do you wish to be shot in the foot or the leg.

Sioux Falls chose to have the line located 4 to 5 miles from the city. This was the route option for them that was the farthest from the city. Harrisburg and Tea were not given a similar option. Harrisburg chose the option that was basically the lesser of two evils. Tea chose the option that was the farthest from the community.

However, testimony from the landowners showed that the properties in this area are not long from residential or commercial development, and the route borders the growth area of Tea.

The Harrisburg route is actually only a quarter mile from Harrisburg city limits. If Harrisburg and Tea were given an option to locate the pipeline an additional 4 to 5 miles farther away from the city, there can be no

doubt that they would have chosen that option. However,

2.3

Dakota Access actually tried to impress the Commission that the Harrisburg route was along the existing power line easement as if it would lessen the area of interference with Harrisburg. Surprisingly, Dakota Access presented this route next to a high voltage power line as being a good location for a high pressure pipeline carrying flammable hazardous liquids.

In five to 10 years I imagine citizens will be asking what were people thinking when they allowed a high pressure pipeline carrying flammable hazardous liquids to be built right next to a high voltage power line, directly in the path of the city's growth? This is the sort of thing we complain about Government bodies doing.

Dakota Access attempts to excuse this encroachment on municipalities by stating that pipelines already run through communities. Well, of course they do, but that is not because communities are inviting them to do so. It's because they needed to be built in these locations at the time they were built.

For instance, railroads dissect urban areas as well but not because people still want them to. Millions of dollars are being spent to remove them, to reroute them. We should not build this type of infrastructure

close to highly populated areas or areas in the path of economic growth unless it is necessary to do so.

2.3

And, in fact, in this instance it is not necessary. It is a fact that the Dakota Access Pipeline does not need to be built through this proposed corridor. The Dakota Access witnesses actually testified that the pipeline does not need to be built in this location.

When witnesses for the Applicant were asked are you aware if there is a need for routing the pipeline so close to the highest populated and highest economic growth area in South Dakota, witness after witness after witness for Dakota Access answered no.

Additionally, the witnesses admitted that the route was dictated by their desire for the shortest distance. The relative cost of rerouting this pipeline farther away from this growth area is pennies to the dollar for a multibillion dollar pipeline.

Dakota Access also testified that one of the criteria is for the route to affect the fewest landowners. This fact alone should disqualify the Dakota Access from the proposed route. For a pipeline that is expected to last for significantly longer than 100 years the number of landowners on the proposed route will increase dramatically.

Dakota Access witnesses testified that they know

of no environmental reason why the route could not be moved farther away from Harrisburg and Tea.

2.3

Dakota Access also implied that the policy members of the communities were engaged in the decisions of the pipeline's route. No doubt some were. However, the correspondence from Mayor John Lawlor of Tea on October 9, 2015, certainly dispelled the allegory that this was a universal practice.

No one can deny that the proposed route goes through the heart of the highest populated and highest economic growth area of South Dakota. And Dakota Access has testified that it does not need to be located there. It is easy to conclude then that it should not be located there.

It is not my intent to keep this pipeline from being built. As I said before, I just want it done right. This action will not stop the pipeline from being built.

And I say that because under South Dakota

Codified Law 49-41B-22.1 there is a reapplication for

permit regarding the Applicant's burden of proof, and

that states in part that when a -- and I'll paraphrase,

that when a permit is previously denied, upon the first

such reapplication the Applicant shall have the burden of

proof to establish only those criteria upon which the

original permit was denied, providing that nothing in the reapplication materially changes the information presented in the original application regarding those criteria upon which the original permit was not denied.

2.3

So basically upon the discretion of the Commission we can allow the Applicant to come back once they have properly routed the pipeline, and that would be the only thing they would need to prove. They would not need to go through the entire process again.

But we do not have the statutory authority to route the pipeline. And I fully agree with that. We should never have the Public Utilities Commissioners routing a pipeline. That is what this docket is all about; routing the pipeline, whether or not we agree with the route of the pipeline under the criteria that is set forth in South Dakota Law.

We do have the authority to deny, accept, or accept with conditions, and we have the responsibility to protect the citizens of South Dakota.

Mr. Chairman, I have additional remarks that I wish to make that are relative to the motion, but I wish to make them at a later time.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion on the substitute motion to deny.

Commissioner Sattgast.

1 ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: 2 Mr. Chairman. May I ask a question of staff on this? 3 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. 4 ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: 5 Commissioner Hanson's interpretation here of shall the 6 Commission grant, deny, or grant with conditions and his 7 interpretation of that we're denying based upon the route, does that conflict with state law as far as us not 8 being able to suggest routes? 10 MS. EDWARDS: It wouldn't in that it's not 11 actually denied -- as I understand his explanation, it's 12 not denied based on the route; it's denied based on 13 unduly interfering with development in the area and 14 limited to the area of, I assume, Lincoln and Minnehaha 15 Counties. 16 So they would reapply and come back, and their 17 burden of proof would be to prove that they didn't unduly interfere in Lincoln and Minnehaha Counties and the 18 19 remainder of the route would be not in issue. 20 ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: This is Acting 21 Commissioner Sattgast here. 22 I have some concerns, I guess, with some of the 2.3 points that were made here, especially concerning growth 2.4 areas and future growth areas.

I would like to think that certain areas have

25

great potential for growth and so expanding beyond what we currently see as bordering on growth areas I think will eventually always be bordering on growth areas especially in a pipeline that's going to exceed a number of years beyond the lifetime of us as South Dakotans.

2.3

2.4

So my deliberations are at this point very trying. I'm working through this with respect to what Commissioner Hanson stated.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: If I could just add,
Mr. Chairman, I do agree completely with counsel's
interpretation of what the discussion was, that it would
only apply to that area.

And to Commissioner Sattgast's concern, from my standpoint it's in the immediate growth area. And it simply has to be routed so that it does not affect the immediate growth area.

There was testimony that --

You're coming across on the Commission -- whoever's speaking. It sounds like Mr. Rappold. I'm not certain.

It would only -- we had testimony at the hearing that people were anticipating development in several of these locations. And it's -- it is interfering with the Nortec property. And my subsequent comments will regard

that to an extent. However, I don't want to flavor the motion with those comments.

2.3

But my concern is that, yes, there will be development in different parts of the state. However, we can easily see and we have had testimony that there will be development in these areas. And it's the highest growth area, economic and population growth area, of the state. So just from that standpoint it just needs to, from my stand, be moved a distance away.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion.

I'd just make two points. And I guess these are more reiteration of some points that I had made earlier. Obviously, the concern that Commissioner Hanson raises is one that I think all three of us have wrestled with from the beginning.

But as I came to my decision point, there were two things that really weighed me to go the direction that I did. And the first is local municipalities have the ability -- those locally affected officials have the ability to define their growth areas. And the company in routing the pipeline from what I can tell has avoided those areas.

Secondly, local units of government, their locally elected officials, have the ability to intervene in this process. Harrisburg did not. Tea did not.

Lincoln County did and didn't offer a word. The City of Sioux Falls did, and their sole concern was how the pipeline related to their landfill and were willing to negotiate an acceptable settlement in that area.

And so I give great credence and weight to the views of those local units of government, and they were silent. And so I struggle with how can I say that I know better than them where their growth might be and how this might impact that growth. I struggle with that, and that drove me to conclude that we were not unduly burdening the growth of that area.

Additional discussion.

Commissioner Hanson.

2.3

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.

It's true that the line was not in the growth area of Tea, but it was moved to the very edge of that growth area, the very edge of it. And to an extent that's where a municipality has the opportunity to argue whether or not it's encumbering their community. So it was moved outside of that sphere, so to speak, for them to argue from it.

Sioux Falls did object. The line was moved 4 to 5 miles away from the community. So the only concern they had at that juncture was the landfill. And they have subsequently had a three- or four-page agreement

prepared on that. So their concerns were taken care of.

2.3

But the silence of Harrisburg does not relieve us of our responsibility to protect the citizens when we know that we are that last bastion of protection for them.

There's a feeling that permeates -- and I've been in local Government a long time. There's a feeling that permeates a group. And you've been with many different groups that are highly influenced by a few individuals or by what they perceive as a wave of individuals. And elected officials occasionally need to be saved from themselves.

I've been there. And the personality of five people, of a five-member group, changes as the people change. And they are influenced, some of them wholly, by a few very influential business people or what is perceived as a chamber of commerce sort of attitude.

And people don't like to be castigated. People don't like to see that they are the opponent, that they are the ones that's keeping this from happening, they're anti-growth, they're opposed to the city moving forward because they're anti all of a sudden.

We still have the responsibility to protect those citizens when we can see -- and they lay it on our doorstep. Fine. We're big enough to carry it. But in

this particular situation their silence does not change the fact that we know that this is the highest growth area, economic and population, in the State of South Dakota. We know that.

2.3

And we also know that it does not need to be there. The Dakota Access testified it does not need to be there. So why should we locate it there when it is so inexpensive to have them simply move it. It's not a huge challenge. Like I say, on a multibillion dollar project this is pennies to the dollar.

Nothing has been constructed yet. They've laid a lot of pipe out apparently in different areas, but all they have to do is draw the -- the lines originally were drawn so sophomorically that, yeah, it looks like a great improvement from what they did afterwards. But that doesn't mean that it should change our position that this needs to be done right. And this simply is not the right way to do it.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion.

Hearing no additional discussion, we will proceed to vote on the substitute motion to deny the permit.

Those in favor of the substitute motion to deny will vote aye; those opposed nay.

Acting Commissioner Sattgast.

1 ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: 2 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Hanson. 3 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. 4 CHAIRMAN NELSON: And Nelson votes nay. substitute motion fails. 5 6 We are now back to the main motion to grant the 7 permit with the conditions as amended. 8 Additional discussion on that motion. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman. 10 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Hanson. 11 COMMISSIONER HANSON: This is a statement that I 12 did not want to flavor the previous motion. 13 Dakota Access is a new corporate citizen of 14 South Dakota. Agreements between Dakota Access and 15 landowners and conditions set by the Commission will have 16 numerous -- have numerous references to Dakota Access 17 agreeing to work with the landowners to resolve a variety 18 of potentially contentious construction issues. 19 Dakota Access has not shown to this Commissioner 20 that they are capable of fulfilling that responsibility. 21 Dakota Access's very own actions have, in fact, clearly 22 shown a disrespect for the concerns of many landowners. 2.3 Bringing lawsuits against the citizens of South Dakota 24 prior to receiving a citing permit is reprehensible. 25 Requesting permission to survey and conducting surveys

where landowners' permission has been granted is totally reasonable and all that was necessary. However, suing the citizens of South Dakota when Dakota Access does not even have a siting permit for the location of the pipeline was abusive.

2.3

Obtaining a survey on those properties was not even necessary prior to the permit process. A multibillion dollar out-of-state corporation trampling on the property rights of South Dakota citizens is not trivial.

Throughout the hearings Dakota Access spoke of how they would work with landowners. However, suing the landowners and actually repeatedly suing landowners when there is not even a need to sue does not show us a corporation that is willing to work with the landowners. This makes me suspect of the willingness to negotiate with our landowners, including Nortec. This is not good corporate citizenship.

Dakota Access's actions, their own actions, are clear evidence, evidence of a corporation that does not give a great deal of care for the people whose property they are crossing.

I will not have the authority to order

Dakota Access and neither does this Commission. However,

I believe Dakota Access should apologize to each

landowner that they sued prior to receiving a permit, and they should reimburse those landowners for the legal costs the landowners incurred opposing the lawsuits.

Although Dakota Access has not shown great corporate citizenship in that respect up to this juncture, they did present a great deal of professional expertise, and they still have that opportunity to prove themselves as being good corporate citizens. I hope that they will.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion on the motion.

Commissioner Sattgast.

2.3

ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: Nearly a year ago I received a phone call from the Governor asking if I would consider filling in on this docket. And with great thought in mind I worked through that and accepted this position.

I've worked six years for local Government as
Director for Association of Counties so I do believe
having worked for them that there is a voice at the local
level. I know sometimes they can be swayed. Typically,
though, it is -- more than not it's in the best interest
of their local citizens. And as has been pointed out,
the local governments were silent, and I believe that
that silence was that they had not heard from their local

citizens that there was opposition or great opposition to this within their communities or near their communities.

2.3

I think that Dakota Access has met its burden.

I think that in the interests of the people of

South Dakota, as well as this nation I think Dakota

Access will be good stewards. And so with that, I will
be supporting this motion.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion.

Let me just play off of perhaps Commissioner
Hanson's last comments. And, again, from my background
as a South Dakota landowner, I would probably share some
of the frustration that Commissioner Hanson has talked
about in how you all have had to deal with or chosen to
deal with some of the landowners.

And if this motion passes, I implore you to do everything you can to make things work for those landowners, including the Stofferahn situation so they can go about their businesses they need to.

Additional discussion.

Commissioner Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

During this process we began this process with numerous hearings across the State of South Dakota. We heard from hundreds of citizens who were opposed to and concerned with the ramifications of a pipeline being

built through their properties, past their communities.

2.3

2.4

The Sioux Falls hearing alone had -- of course, it was the largest. I believe it had somewhere around 400 people there. And it lasted so long that -- and caused us to actually open up areas for additional seating there were so many people.

There were very few people who are in favor of this pipeline. There were a lot of people there just to have questions answered. However, by far, the testimony across the State of South Dakota was in opposition to this pipeline.

I believe there was good reason for them to be concerned, especially with the fact of the lawsuits. And I am, of course, disappointed that we are not able to correct what I see as a major problem with this pipeline.

I would suspect that this -- there were parties who stated that they will be appealing this to the court system in the State of South Dakota, and I know that my remarks will be a part of that process. And I hope that somehow along the line the shortcomings of this project will be corrected so that we do not live to regret our actions here.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion.

Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion to

1 grant the permit with the conditions as amended will vote 2 aye; those opposed nay. 3 Commissioner Sattgast. 4 ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: Aye. 5 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Hanson. 6 COMMISSIONER HANSON: No. 7 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye. The motion carries. I believe we have one additional question. 10 would move that we grant the Joint Motion regarding the 11 Stipulated Findings of Fact, Conditions, and Exhibits as 12 requested by the City of Sioux Falls and Dakota Access. 13 Discussion on the motion. 14 Hearing none, all those in favor will vote aye; 15 those opposed nay. 16 Commissioner Sattgast. ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: 17 18 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Hanson. 19 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye. 21 Motion carries. 22 With that, is there a motion to adjourn? 2.3 ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: So moved. 2.4 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Moved to adjourn. 25 All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed

```
1
     nay.
 2
              Commissioner Sattgast.
 3
              ACTING COMMISSIONER SATTGAST: Aye.
 4
               CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Hanson.
 5
               COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye.
 6
 7
              We are adjourned.
                    (The proceeding is concluded.)
 8
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF SULLY)
4	
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered
6	Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and
7	Notary Public in and for the State of South Dakota:
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed
9	shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings
LO	had in the above-entitled matter on the 30th day of
L1	November, 2015, and that the attached is a true and
L2	correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.
L3	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 10th day of
L 4	December, 2015.
L5	
L 6	
L7	
L 8	Cheri McComsey Wittler,
. 9	Notary Public and Registered Professional Reporter
20	Certified Realtime Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	1	1	1	1
1	58:6	access [2] - 5:15, 44:6	70:20, 71:8, 73:10,	allows [1] - 26:10
•	49-41B-22.1 [1] -	ACCESS [2] - 1:4, 1:5	74:8, 74:19, 75:5,	almost [2] - 52:25,
	63:20	Access [46] - 2:6, 2:7,	75:24, 76:9	53:1
10 [2] - 52:25, 61:10	49-41B-24 [1] - 2:11	2:10, 2:14, 3:10,	additionally [1] -	alone [2] - 62:20, 75:2
100 [2] - 25:15, 62:23	43-41B-24[i] - 2.11	6:13, 13:7, 20:15,	62:13	amend [1] - 43:1
10th [1] - 78:13	F		additions [1] - 41:10	
14 [1] - 32:6	5	23:25, 24:1, 25:17,		amended [6] - 42:6,
• •		26:4, 45:3, 45:6,	address [3] - 9:8,	42:8, 57:13, 57:15,
15-minute [2] - 38:11,	5 [3] - 60:12, 60:25,	45:10, 46:14, 46:18,	27:10, 32:20	71:7, 76:1
38:20	68:23	46:20, 59:24, 60:1,	addressed [1] - 53:6	amending [1] - 41:23
15/16th [1] - 53:1		60:4, 60:6, 61:3,	adequate [2] - 21:9,	Amendment [1] -
150 [1] - 53:1	51 [1] - 30:1	61:7, 61:16, 62:4,	42:22	35:13
16 [1] - 43:10	52 [1] - 30:1	62:6, 62:12, 62:18,	adequately [2] - 47:3,	amendment [12] -
160 [2] - 52:22, 52:23	55 [5] - 16:10, 16:19,	62:21, 62:25, 63:3,	53:6	36:5, 38:2, 38:8,
16A [1] - 40:6	16:22, 16:24, 17:6	63:11, 70:6, 71:13,	adjourn [2] - 76:22,	38:9, 38:24, 40:25,
16B [4] - 37:25, 39:14,		71:14, 71:16, 71:19,	76:24	41:5, 43:3, 43:6,
40:8, 40:13	7	72:3, 72:11, 72:24,	adjourned [1] - 77:7	47:5, 57:3, 57:4
17 [2] - 36:7, 37:1		72:25, 73:4, 74:3,	adjudicate [1] - 25:23	amendments [25] -
17-page [2] - 35:13,		74:6, 76:12	•	
	7 [2] - 37:25, 39:13	Access's [2] - 71:21,	adjustments [1] -	24:9, 24:11, 24:14,
36:5	7:12 [1] - 10:15		37:23	24:16, 28:20, 35:9,
		72:19	admirably [1] - 59:3	35:14, 36:6, 36:11,
2	8	accomplish [1] -	admired [1] - 30:5	36:15, 36:17, 37:2,
		56:14	admit [2] - 17:17,	37:20, 39:1, 39:4,
0 40.04 50.47		accomplishing [1] -	53:15	41:3, 41:16, 41:24,
2 [3] - 43:21, 58:17,	8 [2] - 51:5, 51:8	34:15	admitted [1] - 62:13	42:9, 42:10, 42:12,
58:22	80 [1] - 49:22	accuracy [1] - 30:18	aerial [1] - 40:19	42:13, 43:2, 47:2,
2,000 [3] - 9:16, 11:3,	85 [1] - 16:14	accurate [3] - 6:25,	affect [3] - 28:9,	57:6
11:11		8:12, 56:16	62:19, 66:16	amicable [1] - 5:3
2014 [1] - 19:21	9	acknowledgment [1] -	affected [9] - 9:12,	AN [1] - 1:4
2015 [4] - 1:8, 63:7,	9	34:17		analyzed [1] - 21:8
78:11, 78:14		acreage [3] - 7:16,	25:1, 27:6, 28:25,	ancestral [1] - 5:17
24 [1] - 44:2	9 [3] - 6:18, 20:24,	8:6, 49:23	29:1, 29:18, 35:12,	
25 [1] - 40:15	63:7	·	58:20, 67:19	answer [7] - 8:1, 31:4,
27 [1] - 11:23	91.72 [1] - 50:9	acres [1] - 52:22	afterwards [3] - 8:11,	31:9, 32:11, 39:7,
28 [1] - 12:16	92 [1] - 50:10	acting [3] - 2:2, 65:20,	49:16, 70:15	47:20, 53:13
	32 [1] = 30.10	70:25	agencies [2] - 48:22,	answered [2] - 62:12,
29 [1] - 44:12	•	ACTING [16] - 1:12,	48:25	75:9
	– A	16:6, 16:12, 16:16,	agency [6] - 48:14,	answers [1] - 53:5
3		38:18, 42:2, 57:9,	48:22, 49:7, 52:9,	anti [3] - 50:6, 69:21,
	ability [3] - 67:19,	65:1, 65:4, 65:20,	53:23, 55:2	69:22
2 ros 42:24 44:4	67:20, 67:24	71:1, 73:13, 76:4,	ago [3] - 19:9, 48:1,	anti-growth [1] -
3 [2] - 43:21, 44:1	1	76:17, 76:23, 77:3	73:13	69:21
30 [4] - 1:8, 40:16,	able [7] - 5:17, 11:18,	action [1] - 63:17	agree [8] - 11:2,	anticipating [2] - 37:9,
40:17, 40:25	28:10, 40:21, 44:10,	actions [4] - 71:21,	41:18, 51:13, 53:12,	66:23
300 [2] - 6:21, 7:15	65:9, 75:14	72:19, 75:22		
30th [1] - 78:10	aboriginal [6] - 4:11,	activities [2] - 44:16,	59:20, 64:11, 64:14,	anticipation [1] - 2:21
34 [1] - 15:8	4:14, 4:17, 5:1, 5:12,	44:19	66:11	anyway [1] - 4:1
35 [2] - 40:14, 40:16	5:13		agreed [2] - 23:10,	apartment [1] - 30:4
350-feet-wide [1] -	above-entitled [1] -	actual [4] - 8:14, 9:20,	43:14	apologize [3] - 22:15,
49:18	78:10	9:23, 15:12	agreeing [1] - 71:17	24:4, 72:25
370 [1] - 12:12	absent [1] - 54:25	Adam [1] - 1:15	agreement [4] - 23:12,	appealing [1] - 75:17
370.5 [1] - 12:20	absolute [3] - 4:16,	add [2] - 43:11, 66:10	23:15, 56:21, 68:25	applicable [3] - 26:22,
39 [1] - 45:2	4:25, 28:11	added [3] - 45:6, 46:8,	agreements [1] -	36:18, 39:5
3:00 [1] - 38:21	absolutely [7] - 11:5,	46:12	71:14	Applicant [9] - 23:11,
J.UU [1] - JO.Z I	13:13, 14:2, 30:10,	adding [1] - 41:24	ahead [3] - 16:4, 31:9,	26:12, 31:20, 47:14,
4	53:19, 54:21, 54:23	addition [2] - 19:20,	57:25	58:7, 58:12, 62:8,
4		24:8	Ailts [1] - 1:14	63:24, 64:6
	abundantly [1] - 9:15	additional [24] - 4:6,	alleging [1] - 11:25	Applicant's [3] -
A M - 58.17 60.11	abusive [1] - 72:5	23:20, 41:7, 41:8,		26:15, 58:6, 63:21
4 [4] - 58:17, 60:11,	accept [2] - 64:17,	41:14, 42:13, 45:11,	allegory [1] - 63:7	
60:25, 68:22	64:18	52:21, 57:4, 60:24,	allow [4] - 5:14, 36:10,	application [3] - 2:5,
400 [1] - 75:4	acceptable [1] - 68:4		53:22, 64:6	32:4, 64:3
47 [1] - 46:8	accepted [2] - 55:15,	64:20, 64:23, 66:9,	allowed [2] - 61:2,	APPLICATION [1] -
49-41B-22 [2] - 26:16,	73:16	07.10, 08:12, 70:19,	61:11	1:4
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	67:10, 68:12, 70:19,		1

behalf [1] - 4:8 61:20, 61:21, 62:5, Certified [2] - 78:6, 2 application's [1] attempts [1] - 61:16 8:11 attend [1] - 11:17 behind [2] - 19:24 62:7, 63:16, 63:18, 78:19 applied [1] - 47:19 75:1 certified [3] - 47:23, attitude [1] - 69:17 belongs [2] - 8:7, bunch [1] - 49:22 47:24 53:23, 55:6 apply [2] - 54:20, attorney [1] - 19:13 burden [7] - 26:15, beloved [1] - 25:18 **CERTIFY** [1] - 78:8 66:13 attractive [1] - 30:11 58:6, 58:13, 63:21, appointed [1] - 78:8 audience [2] - 24:17, benefit [1] - 2:16 **certifying** [5] - 48:14, appreciate [19] - 3:5, benefited [1] - 56:22 63:24, 65:17, 74:3 48:21, 48:22, 48:25, 5:6, 10:21, 11:20, August [1] - 52:7 best [2] - 34:2, 73:22 **burdening** [1] - 68:10 49:7 18:15, 21:1, 22:24, burrow [1] - 4:10 CHAIRMAN [91] authority [8] - 28:17, bet [1] - 23:18 23:2, 24:24, 25:14, 28:19, 31:24, 31:25, better [2] - 34:5, 68:8 business [6] - 2:4, 1:11, 2:1, 4:6, 4:22, 41:6, 41:11, 52:1, 20:2, 20:16, 26:11, 5:6, 5:20, 6:7, 7:21, 32:12, 64:10, 64:17, between [7] - 23:10, 55:17, 55:18, 55:20, 26:13, 69:16 10:21, 11:20, 12:10, 72:23 24:1, 28:24, 37:4, 56:8, 57:1, 57:20 available [1] - 39:16 businesses [1] -12:17, 12:20, 13:1, 46:3, 55:19, 71:14 appreciative [1] - 59:9 74:18 13:3, 13:6, 13:10, avoid [1] - 16:25 beyond [6] - 24:16, 13:13, 13:18, 14:7, approaching [1] avoided [1] - 67:21 41:13, 46:9, 54:21, C 14:13, 14:18, 15:5, 34:12 66:1, 66:5 aware [8] - 7:18, 16:3, 16:1, 16:4, 16:17, appropriate [2] - 22:6, 17:5, 17:8, 17:10, **big** [2] - 30:20, 69:25 17:3, 17:21, 18:4, 22:8 17:15, 17:20, 62:9 bigger [1] - 8:1 calculation [1] - 32:8 18:15, 19:15, 20:6, approve [1] - 38:1 awkward [1] - 12:2 binding [1] - 21:9 cannot [4] - 28:17, approved [2] - 38:1, 20:10, 20:19, 20:22, aye [25] - 38:14, 38:16, Bird [1] - 4:8 28:19, 51:22, 58:23 20:25, 21:4, 21:20, 43:6 38:18, 38:19, 41:24, BIRD [2] - 4:19, 4:23 capable [1] - 71:20 22:4, 22:10, 22:24, **arbitrary** [1] - 54:6 42:2, 42:4, 42:5, bit [10] - 4:10, 15:15, cards [1] - 10:9 23:20, 35:24, 36:3, area [29] - 15:23, 57:7, 57:9, 57:11, 15:22, 24:7, 24:19, care [6] - 3:23, 22:10, 37:8, 37:11, 37:16, 19:16, 26:25, 27:20, 57:12, 70:24, 71:3, 27:8, 36:12, 43:24, 36:2, 50:17, 69:1, 37:19, 37:24, 38:7, 27:24, 28:12, 28:15, 76:2, 76:4, 76:7, 50:22, 51:10 72.21 38:17, 38:19, 38:23, 30:2, 30:5, 32:3, 76:14, 76:17, 76:19, **bodies** [4] - 27:6, careful [1] - 11:12 39:25, 40:24, 41:2, 58:17, 60:19, 60:21, 76:20, 76:25, 77:3, 28:12, 58:20, 61:15 carefully [1] - 29:12 41:17, 41:21, 42:3, 61:6, 62:11, 62:16, 77:5, 77:6 **bond** [1] - 3:20 carries [2] - 76:8, 42:5, 47:13, 47:18, 63:11, 65:13, 65:14, bonding [2] - 3:6, 3:7 76:21 52:1, 53:9, 54:17, 66:13, 66:15, 66:17, В bonds [1] - 3:19 carry [1] - 69:25 55:17, 56:6, 57:1, 67:7, 68:4, 68:11, **Boomsma** [4] - 6:8, carrying [2] - 61:9, 57:10, 57:12, 57:25, 68:16, 68:17, 70:3 6:9, 6:10, 20:17 background [2] -61:12 58:8, 58:11, 64:23, areas [16] - 27:12, bordering [2] - 66:2, 25:10, 74:10 65:3, 66:9, 67:10, case [7] - 25:24, 26:1, 27:16, 27:17, 61:22, 66:3 BAKER [3] - 4:24, 37:17, 40:3, 51:17, 70:19, 71:2, 71:4, 62:1, 65:24, 65:25, borders [1] - 60:21 5:11, 6:2 54:24, 55:11 71:10, 73:10, 74:8, 66:2, 66:3, 67:6, bother [1] - 10:11 75:24, 76:5, 76:7, baker [1] - 4:8 cases [2] - 10:9, 28:5 67:20, 67:22, 70:12, bottom [2] - 43:21, 76:18. 76:20. 76:24. balance [1] - 53:1 cast [1] - 7:2 75:5 56:20 77:4. 77:6 balances [1] - 33:10 castigated [1] - 69:18 argue [2] - 68:18, bought [1] - 15:14 Chairman [13] - 2:1, barn [2] - 15:2, 17:14 caused [1] - 75:5 68:21 **bound** [1] - 25:23 3:3, 4:20, 4:24, 13:3, barrier [1] - 15:17 cease [1] - 45:12 argument [2] - 4:15, **boundaries** [1] - 49:2 35:17, 58:3, 64:20, based [15] - 3:16, center [1] - 12:13 29:11 **box** [1] - 51:3 65:2, 66:11, 71:9, 3:25, 16:21, 25:24, certain [2] - 65:25, arisen [1] - 27:9 Brett [2] - 56:15, 56:20 74:21, 75:23 26:18, 26:19, 49:6, 66:21 arrived [1] - 24:20 Brian [1] - 1:16 **challenge** [1] - 70:9 49:20, 50:1, 51:23, certainly [12] - 4:22, association [1] brief [2] - 4:20, 5:21 53:11, 59:10, 65:7, chamber [1] - 69:17 6:13, 17:19, 24:21, 73:19 briefing [3] - 2:18, chance [1] - 15:4 65:12 24:22, 30:23, 53:9, Association [1] - 23:9 2:23, 54:13 change [6] - 38:2, basic [1] - 44:7 53:11, 54:18, 59:23, assume [2] - 56:23, **brilliant** [2] - 59:3, 40:25, 43:7, 69:15, bastion [1] - 69:4 63:7, 65:3 65:14 59:5 bear [1] - 4:19 70:1, 70:16 CERTIFICATE [1] assuming [1] - 37:14 bring [1] - 30:22 became [2] - 49:14, changed [2] - 9:3, 78:2 assumptions [4] bringing [2] - 55:21, 38:5 certification [22] -49:25 31:15, 31:17, 31:21, 71:23 become [3] - 28:5, changes [2] - 64:2, 48:3, 48:12, 48:13, 31:23 brings [2] - 30:23 69.14 33:1, 55:6 48:16, 48:20, 49:3, assurances [1] - 32:7 brought [1] - 8:16 Charlie [1] - 47:25 becomes [1] - 8:19 49:12, 49:15, 49:20, **assure** [1] - 37:16 buffalo [2] - 55:23 Cheri [2] - 1:23, 78:18 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:10 49:23, 51:16, 52:4, assured [1] - 7:9 **build** [2] - 55:8, 61:25 52:6, 52:16, 53:3, CHERI [1] - 78:5 began [2] - 33:14, attached [1] - 78:11 **building** [3] - 19:25, 53:18, 53:24, 54:5, choose [1] - 22:25 74:22 attachment [1] - 12:16 20:1, 30:4 beginning [2] - 46:19, 54:8, 55:2, 55:5, choosing [1] - 28:24 attachments [1] - 5:16 built [9] - 11:6, 61:13, 67:15 55:10 chose [4] - 60:5, attempt [1] - 17:19

60:11, 60:14, 60:16 73:13, 74:21, 76:4, contractual [2] coming [3] - 19:24, conclusory [1] - 29:16 chosen [2] - 61:1, 34:11, 66:19 76:6, 76:17, 76:19, condition [9] - 17:1, 51:18, 55:19 74:13 commendable [1] -76:23, 77:3, 77:5 26:24, 46:8, 50:11, contradicted [2] commissioner [1] -50:14, 51:8, 51:10, 29:25, 59:7 Chris [1] - 2:1 34.19 CHRIS [1] - 1:11 2:3 56:21, 58:15 comment [3] - 12:7, conversation [3] circumstance [1] -39:1, 41:3 Commissioners [10] -Condition [5] - 40:14, 9:23, 14:15, 16:13 14:5 commentary [3] -2:16, 2:22, 10:24, 40:16, 44:2, 44:12, conversations [1] -24:12, 26:19, 35:15, cities [1] - 27:25 6:17, 11:23, 57:2 45.2 9:24 citing [1] - 71:24 comments [10] -36:13, 43:8, 47:4, conditions [11] - 2:9, cooperatively [1] - 5:2 64.12 citizen [1] - 71:13 11:18, 15:18, 15:22, 2:13, 23:25, 34:13, coordinating [1] commitment [2] citizens [11] - 61:10, 32:21, 57:20, 57:21, 35:20, 64:18, 65:6, 59:13 7:19, 25:8 59:18, 66:25, 67:2, 71:7, 71:15, 76:1, coordination [1] -64:19, 69:3, 69:24, 74:10 commodity [2] -76:11 71:23, 72:3, 72:9, 15:21 73:8, 73:23, 74:1, commerce [1] - 69:17 43:22, 43:23 Conditions [8] copies [2] - 36:7, common [1] - 16:12 16:18, 21:22, 24:16, 74:24 commercial [1] -42:18 34:9, 34:11, 34:14, 60:20 communities [6] citizenship [2] copy [1] - 42:17 35:9, 56:11 Commission [25] -61:18, 61:19, 63:4, 72:18, 73:5 corporate [4] - 71:13, 2:9, 2:11, 2:15, 3:2, 74:2, 75:1 conduct [1] - 26:13 city [5] - 60:12, 60:13, 72:18, 73:5, 73:8 6:17, 7:7, 9:3, 9:11, community [3] conducted [2] - 26:9, 60:23, 60:25, 69:21 corporation [3] - 72:8, 21:16, 23:1, 29:1, 60:17, 68:19, 68:23 59:1 72:15, 72:20 City [6] - 2:14, 27:21, company [11] - 11:9, conducting [1] - 71:25 28:6, 28:8, 68:1, 32:23, 35:15, 35:22, correct [13] - 4:2, 37:12, 39:10, 41:6, 21:6, 21:19, 31:1, confirmed [1] - 27:20 76:12 4:18, 5:10, 7:22, 34:10, 41:11, 43:14, 41:19, 51:1, 61:4, conflict [1] - 65:8 city's [1] - 61:14 7:25, 12:3, 22:21, 45:19, 45:25, 46:6, 64:6, 65:6, 66:19, civil [1] - 10:11 **confusion** [1] - 33:5 27:22, 41:17, 58:9, 71:15, 72:24 67:20 consider [2] - 35:16, 58:10, 75:15, 78:12 claim [5] - 4:11, 4:13, COMMISSION [3] company's [1] - 22:11 73:15 5:13, 6:25, 29:25 corrected [1] - 75:21 1:1, 1:10, 1:13 compared [1] - 52:9 considerable [1] claimed [1] - 51:7 corrections [1] - 41:12 Commission's [1] compensated [1] -5.21 correctly [7] - 4:16, claiming [1] - 6:19 **claims** [1] - 6:20 8:25 51:15 consideration [3] -8:18, 12:11, 13:19, Commissioner [44] complain [1] - 61:15 3:11, 27:5, 58:19 14:20, 34:4, 45:22 clarification [1] - 44:3 2:2, 4:24, 8:20, complete [2] - 23:16, consistent [3] - 37:2, clarified [1] - 6:25 correspondence [1] -10:14, 12:14, 12:21, 43:12 40:17. 40:23 63:6 clarify [4] - 7:12, 21:2, 16:4, 23:5, 23:6, completely [2] construct [5] - 2:6, corridor [1] - 62:5 39:12, 58:9 23:20, 25:23, 36:24, 32:10, 66:11 49:8, 54:4, 54:15, clarifying [3] - 2:22, cost [2] - 3:25, 62:15 37:8, 38:15, 38:17, comply [6] - 26:21, 55:9 18:16, 18:21 costs [2] - 3:17, 73:3 39:9, 40:7, 42:1, 47:15, 54:4, 54:12, CONSTRUCT [1] - 1:5 counsel [9] - 35:15, Clark [1] - 23:8 42:3, 47:16, 57:8, 55:3, 58:5 constructed [3] -37:5, 37:12, 41:7, clean [1] - 37:21 57:10, 57:16, 64:25, comprehensive [1] -26:8, 41:10, 70:11 41:19, 47:9, 56:3, clear [8] - 6:14, 9:15, 65:5, 65:21, 66:8, 36:5 constructing [1] -32:23, 45:24, 49:2, 66:14, 67:13, 68:13, concept [3] - 50:6, 49:17 counsel's [1] - 66:11 49:14, 50:1, 72:20 70:25, 71:2, 71:10, 51:13 construction [9] counties [5] - 28:1, cleared [1] - 22:23 71:19, 73:12, 74:9, concern [17] - 4:12, 2:10, 3:17, 3:18, 31:6, 65:15, 65:18, clearly [3] - 29:25, 74:12, 74:20, 76:3, 5:21, 10:23, 13:20, 26:9, 45:13, 46:19, 73:19 40:12, 71:21 76:5, 76:16, 76:18, 17:3, 17:6, 27:12, 46:21, 48:16, 71:18 country [1] - 26:14 clients [1] - 59:2 77:2, 77:4 28:8, 28:10, 45:14, constructive [2] -County [3] - 6:19, clip [1] - 15:6 **COMMISSIONER** [51] 45:23, 46:5, 66:14, 11:14, 49:24 28:7, 68:1 close [8] - 12:1, 12:13, - 1:11, 1:12, 3:3, 67:3, 67:13, 68:2, contact [3] - 7:12, 14:11, 28:1, 32:12, **COUNTY** [1] - 78:3 3:21, 4:4, 16:6, 68:23 56:5. 56:17 couple [2] - 21:4, 52:2 33:18, 62:1, 62:10 16:12, 16:16, 23:7, concerned [6] - 7:11, contacted [5] - 19:11, course [4] - 59:18, closed [2] - 47:25, 23:17, 23:19, 35:17, 15:17, 50:22, 51:10, 19:14, 19:15, 20:17, 61:18, 75:2, 75:14 50:9 36:1, 36:25, 37:9, 74:25, 75:13 20.20 court [2] - 51:1, 75:17 closest [1] - 15:23 37:14, 37:18, 37:22, concerning [2] - 3:23, contacts [2] - 7:6, 8:9 courts [1] - 10:12 closing [1] - 9:18 38:4, 38:16, 38:18, 65:23 **contention** [1] - 11:3 cover [1] - 21:18 cloth [1] - 52:11 40:4. 40:9. 41:15. concerns [6] - 12:24, covered [2] - 21:10, contentious [1] cloths [2] - 48:19, 41:18, 42:2, 42:4, 28:3, 29:10, 65:22, 71:18 46:11 52:10 57:9. 57:11. 57:17. 69:1, 71:22 context [2] - 43:24, covering [1] - 21:10 Codified [2] - 58:6, 58:3, 58:10, 58:12, conclude [2] - 63:13, 50:25 create [2] - 51:11, 63:20 65:1, 65:4, 65:20, 68:10 continued [1] - 48:2 51:12 colors [1] - 42:11 66:10, 68:14, 71:1, concluded [1] - 77:8 continues [2] - 5:2, comfortable [1] created [1] - 30:6 71:3, 71:9, 71:11, **conclusion** [1] - 44:19 46:2 creative [1] - 44:8 32:10

39:23, 58:4, 63:9, dispelled [1] - 63:7 credence [1] - 68:5 damaged [1] - 45:8 E Cremer [1] - 1:15 damages [5] - 49:11, 64:17, 64:24, 65:6, disqualify [1] - 62:20 70:21, 70:23 49:15, 50:13, 50:14, criteria [8] - 27:13, disrespect [1] - 71:22 e-mail [8] - 6:15, 6:18, denying [1] - 65:7 53.6 29:8, 30:15, 51:24, dissect [1] - 61:22 department [1] - 31:11 11:23, 12:8, 12:11, 62:19, 63:25, 64:4, Dansman [4] - 6:18, distance [3] - 14:10, 12:16, 12:22, 13:19 7:7, 8:8, 11:14 Department [5] -64:15 62:15, 67:9 **Eagle** [1] - 6:2 critical [2] - 27:25, Dansman-Nichols [3] 31:13, 31:21, 31:22, distribute [1] - 42:19 ease [1] - 47:11 39:24 -6:18, 7:7, 11:14 32:1, 32:9 disturbed [1] - 45:8 easement [7] - 19:7, crop [1] - 46:10 **DAPL** [7] - 7:22, 19:6, deputy [1] - 10:13 dive [1] - 8:2 32:24, 47:25, 49:18, cropland [2] - 43:23, 29:25, 32:4, 32:7, deserve [1] - 31:8 divergence [1] - 58:25 55:14, 56:4, 61:5 34:17, 35:5 design [3] - 17:12, 43:24 diving [1] - 31:10 easements [1] - 50:12 Darren [1] - 1:17 17:14, 17:17 crops [4] - 43:22, **DO** [1] - 78:8 easily [3] - 13:22, designated [1] - 27:16 43:23, 50:13, 54:9 date [2] - 8:15, 51:6 docket [7] - 27:10, 28:2. 67:5 cross [2] - 11:25, 60:6 Dated [1] - 78:13 designs [1] - 16:24 32:22, 33:8, 33:9, easy [2] - 28:4, 63:13 cross-examination [1] dated [1] - 6:18 desire [1] - 62:14 59:13, 64:13, 73:15 economic [8] - 26:24, - 60:6 details [1] - 17:14 dating [1] - 8:10 document [2] - 22:6, 29:13, 58:15, 62:2, crossed [4] - 6:4, daughter [1] - 8:10 **determine** [2] - 8:13, 39:13 62:10, 63:11, 67:7, 29:5, 29:14, 29:24 **dB** [1] - 16:19 45:4 documented [1] -70:3 crossing [3] - 6:5, **DBH** [2] - 16:10, 16:22 determined [2] - 7:14, 31:21 edge [6] - 13:15, 39:17, 72:22 8:3 de [1] - 1:15 documenting [1] -16:11, 16:24, 27:23, crossings [1] - 39:22 **developers** [1] - 33:12 deal [6] - 22:25, 30:20, 29:13 68:16, 68:17 CRR [1] - 1:23 72:21, 73:6, 74:13, development [13] documents [3] - 21:6, Edwards [8] - 1:14, crucial [1] - 33:25 74:14 27:4, 29:4, 29:18, 22:16 6:23, 7:2, 7:5, 8:6, crude [1] - 14:10 dealing [1] - 46:13 29:23, 30:9, 30:14, dollar [5] - 62:17, 11:2, 17:21, 21:4 58:18, 60:20, 65:13, **cultural** [1] - 5:5 deals [2] - 6:15, 14:19 70:9, 70:10, 72:8 EDWARDS [9] - 7:5, dealt [1] - 15:15 66:23, 67:4, 67:6 current [1] - 27:22 dollars [1] - 61:24 11:5, 12:21, 17:24, device [1] - 12:9 **Deb** [3] - 7:6, 7:9, domain [4] - 32:20, 21:13, 22:3, 22:7, dictated [1] - 62:14 D 12:22 32:25, 33:6, 33:10 56:12, 65:10 different [8] - 5:7, December [2] - 8:5, done [8] - 3:22, 35:3, effect [1] - 8:19 10:16, 22:13, 38:6, 41:19, 44:25, 45:22, 78:14 Dakota [84] - 2:5, 2:7, effort [1] - 45:19 decibel [2] - 16:8, 60:8, 67:4, 69:9, 60:2, 63:16, 70:17 2:10, 2:14, 3:9, 6:13, either [8] - 14:25, 70:12 17:10 doorstep [1] - 69:25 10:25, 13:7, 20:15, 20:20, 35:24, 36:12, directed [3] - 33:1, decibels [1] - 16:24 doubt [3] - 34:22, 23:8, 23:25, 24:1, 36:17, 39:4, 51:1, decide [1] - 23:1 56:4, 59:18 61:1, 63:5 25:14, 25:17, 25:19, 55:13 decision [5] - 24:20, direction [2] - 48:4, down [8] - 18:8, 19:24, 25:25, 26:4, 28:22, elected [2] - 67:24, 67:17 26:2, 26:17, 35:22, 24:13, 28:23, 28:24, 30:23, 30:25, 31:3, 69:11 directly [2] - 45:3, 31:5, 39:14, 51:5 67:16 31:8, 35:6, 35:12, eliminate [1] - 35:1 61:14 decisions [5] - 25:24, downstairs [1] - 11:7 41:9, 45:3, 45:6, eliminated [1] - 53:21 director [1] - 73:19 32:25, 33:4, 33:6, drain [9] - 45:8, 45:10, 45:10, 46:14, 46:18, **eliminates** [1] - 46:5 disagree [1] - 53:9 63:4 45:12, 45:14, 45:16, 46:20, 48:23, 50:10, emergency [4] disappointed [1] decompaction [2] -45:17, 45:23, 46:1, 50:21, 54:25, 58:5, 21:24, 21:25, 22:9, 75:14 34:5, 34:6 46:4 59:24, 60:1, 60:4, 22:19 discretion [2] - 49:1, defending [1] - 50:25 dramatically [1] -60:6, 61:3, 61:7, eminent [4] - 32:20, 64:5 define [1] - 67:20 62:24 61:16, 62:4, 62:6, 32:24, 33:6, 33:10 definitely [1] - 56:18 **discuss** [1] - 37:3 draw [1] - 70:13 62:11, 62:12, 62:18, **emphasize** [1] - 58:22 discussed [2] - 11:13, drawn [1] - 70:14 definition [1] - 55:1 62:21, 62:25, 63:3, emphasized [2] definitionally [1] -56:16 **drive** [1] - 50:15 63:11, 63:19, 64:16, 29:7, 58:24 discussing [2] - 33:8, 50:24 drop [3] - 48:19, 64:19, 70:4, 70:6, employed [2] - 44:14, 33:9 deliberations [1] -52:10, 52:11 71:13, 71:14, 71:16, 44:18 discussion [29] - 21:5, 66.6 **drove** [1] - 68:10 71:19, 71:21, 71:23, employee [1] - 19:21 24:2, 24:3, 29:4, delineated [1] - 49:2 due [2] - 27:4, 58:19 72:3, 72:9, 72:11, encroachment [1] -29:6, 38:9, 38:12, delivering [1] - 26:13 **duly** [1] - 78:8 72:19, 72:24, 72:25, 61:17 41:4, 41:14, 41:22, demonstrated [1] duly-appointed [1] -73:4, 74:3, 74:5, encumbering [1] -42:7, 43:3, 47:5, 74:11, 74:23, 75:10, 68:19 48:6, 57:4, 57:14, during [6] - 16:7, 32:6, demonstration [1] -75:18, 76:12, 78:7, end [4] - 18:18, 44:18, 64:23, 66:9, 66:12, 34:20, 40:19, 55:22, 78:13 45:6, 56:24 67:10, 68:12, 70:19, 74:22 denied [6] - 63:23, **DAKOTA** [4] - 1:2, 1:4, ends [2] - 6:14, 33:23 70:20, 71:8, 73:10, 64:1, 64:4, 65:11, 1:5, 78:1 **energy** [1] - 2:6 74:8, 74:19, 75:24, 65:12 Dakotans [1] - 66:5 **ENERGY** [1] - 1:5 76:13

deny [10] - 2:9, 35:19,

76:11 27:22, 28:6, 28:8, 30:1 fueling [1] - 48:19 engaged [1] - 63:4 engineer [1] - 17:12 Exhibits [1] - 30:1 28:15, 30:2, 47:24, filing [2] - 8:11, 10:10 fulfilling [1] - 71:20 existing [2] - 30:1, 60:11, 68:2, 68:22, filling [1] - 73:15 enlighten [1] - 55:25 full [2] - 32:5, 45:9 61:5 75:2, 76:12 Findings [2] - 2:13, entered [1] - 19:6 fully [2] - 25:14, 64:11 familiar [1] - 12:24 expanding [1] - 66:1 76:11 entertained [1] - 59:3 function [2] - 45:9, expansion [1] - 20:2 family [3] - 6:11, 25:7, fine [5] - 13:9, 22:24, entire [3] - 44:23, 45:12 **expect** [1] - 54:6 47.24 40:24, 58:2, 69:25 future [3] - 25:8, 59:13, 64:9 fantastic [1] - 41:20 entitled [2] - 9:22, expectation [1] finished [1] - 45:22 55:16, 65:24 far [5] - 14:11, 19:20, First [1] - 35:13 78:10 14:14 environment [2] expected [4] - 26:25, 53:12, 65:8, 75:9 first [17] - 4:7, 6:15, G 58:16, 58:23, 62:22 farm [9] - 12:2, 50:19, 9:5, 9:7, 24:7, 24:25, 26:24, 58:15 50:21, 51:14, 53:22, environmental [1] experience [2] -27:10, 27:14, 32:5, **GARY** [1] - 1:11 54:10, 55:2, 55:10, 33:22, 34:22 34:4, 34:22, 43:10, 63:1 gather [4] - 4:13, 4:17, experiences [1] -55:23 44:21, 44:23, 44:25, epoxy [1] - 52:11 5:10, 6:1 farmed [1] - 47:24 equipment [3] - 39:16, 59:23 63:23, 67:18 gathering [2] - 5:1, expert [1] - 48:24 farmer [4] - 33:15, fits [1] - 48:4 39:19, 39:22 5.22 46:7, 51:7, 55:6 five [3] - 61:10, 69:13, equivalent [1] - 16:11 expertise [1] - 73:7 generally [1] - 5:14 farmers [2] - 26:10, 69:14 errors [1] - 36:21 **explain** [3] - 10:22, generational [1] - 25:7 34:1 five-member [1] especially [3] - 65:23, 30:20, 57:19 gentleman [3] - 14:11, farming [7] - 12:2, 69:14 66:4, 75:13 explained [2] - 46:4, 17:13, 55:22 46:16, 47:22, 48:5, 47:3 fixing [1] - 46:1 essentially [1] - 55:13 **gentlemen** [1] - 18:9 50:18, 50:23, 51:15 flag [1] - 56:13 establish [4] - 5:18, explanation [2] given [11] - 6:21, 7:17, 32:15, 58:13, 63:25 43:11, 65:11 **farmland** [2] - 7:17, flammable [2] - 61:9, 25:6, 27:5, 27:12, 25:19 61:12 established [5] expressed [1] - 5:20 31:25, 32:11, 45:18, 16:19, 33:7, 46:17, farms [4] - 25:7, 51:9, flavor [2] - 67:1, 71:12 extend [1] - 54:20 58:19, 60:14, 60:24 extent [3] - 55:19, 54:9 flexibility [2] - 13:24, 48:8, 53:11 glad [1] - 40:7 farmstead [1] - 15:12 14:11 estimate [3] - 31:14, 67:1, 68:17 goal [1] - 34:15 farthest [2] - 60:13, flights [1] - 40:19 31:23, 32:13 extraordinarily [2] goodness [1] - 28:4 60:16 floor [4] - 2:25, 23:22, estimated [2] - 3:16, 59:3. 59:4 governing [3] - 27:5, fashion [2] - 9:13, 38:24, 38:25 3:18 **extremely** [1] - 43:15 28:12, 58:20 59:2 estimates [1] - 30:18 flower [1] - 5:8 Government [3] fatal [1] - 11:4 eventually [2] - 60:2, focus [1] - 43:9 61:15, 69:7, 73:18 father [4] - 7:16, 7:17, folks [6] - 25:13, **government** [4] - 27:6, evidence [4] - 25:25, 8:7, 8:10 28:16, 33:5, 35:4, faced [1] - 52:15 58:21, 67:23, 68:6 59:22, 72:20 favor [8] - 38:13, 44:6, 50:15 facilities [1] - 22:19 governments [2] -41:23, 57:5, 70:23, follow [4] - 2:22, evidentiary [1] - 18:19 **FACILITY** [1] - 1:5 31:7, 73:24 75:7, 75:25, 76:14, 11:22, 16:17, 57:22 evils [1] - 60:15 facility [11] - 2:6, Governor [2] - 33:7, 76:25 **follow-up** [1] - 2:22 exact [1] - 27:19 21:25, 22:1, 22:17, 73:14 fear [1] - 50:16 followed [1] - 10:19 exactly [2] - 5:24, 22:21, 26:21, 26:22, grand [1] - 33:22 federal [1] - 16:22 follows [1] - 27:23 37:11 27:1, 27:3, 58:13, grant [10] - 2:9, 2:12, feedback [1] - 52:1 examination [2] **font** [1] - 38:5 58:17 23:24, 53:24, 65:6, feet [7] - 6:21, 7:15, food [2] - 26:11, 34:2 24:12, 60:6 fact [18] - 5:21, 7:11, 71:6, 76:1, 76:10 30:3, 40:15, 40:16, example [2] - 10:8, **foot** [1] - 60:10 7:23, 9:8, 14:13, granted [2] - 14:14, 40:17, 40:25 FOR [1] - 1:4 55:4 17:4. 18:23. 30:2. 72:1 fellow [5] - 2:16, exceed [1] - 66:4 forgive [1] - 3:8 31:17, 46:18, 52:5, grass [2] - 34:7, 44:22 10:24, 24:12, 43:8, excellent [2] - 18:15, form [2] - 6:17, 55:1 55:18, 62:3, 62:4, great [10] - 13:19, 47:3 59:10 forth [1] - 64:16 62:20, 70:2, 71:21, 39:7, 66:1, 68:5, felt [1] - 53:5 except [1] - 44:3 forum [2] - 33:8, 33:9 75:13 70:14, 72:21, 73:4, fence [5] - 12:5, 13:23, exception [2] - 44:9, forward [2] - 23:1, Fact [2] - 2:13, 76:11 73:6, 73:15, 74:1 16:11, 16:20, 59:8 57:6 69:21 factor [2] - 3:14, 4:1 greater [1] - 35:11 few [3] - 69:9, 69:16, excess [1] - 54:10 **four** [4] - 27:3, 42:19, factored [2] - 3:18, greatly [1] - 52:2 75:7 exclusive [1] - 54:16 52:24, 68:25 3.50 green [8] - 30:6, fewest [1] - 62:19 excuse [5] - 35:17, four-page [1] - 68:25 facts [2] - 2:12, 25:25 30:11, 42:10, 42:12, field [6] - 12:2, 12:6, 40:4, 40:5, 58:8, four-pager [1] - 42:19 fails [1] - 71:5 43:2, 43:7, 43:9, 12:13, 13:15, 13:21, 61:16 frankly [3] - 25:9, fair [1] - 24:11 executed [1] - 23:15 25:19, 43:23 fairly [1] - 13:22 Greg [1] - 1:16 figure [4] - 35:18, exercise [1] - 5:18 friendly [1] - 40:25 faith [1] - 50:12 **Gregg** [3] - 7:6, 7:9, 35:19. 44:7. 56:14 exercising [1] - 5:4 front [3] - 40:1, 51:1, Faith [1] - 6:2 12.22 **figuring** [1] - 3:5 Exhibit [1] - 27:22 51.2 ground [2] - 52:5, Falls [12] - 2:14, filed [3] - 21:7, 27:21, exhibits [2] - 2:13, frustration [1] - 74:12

53:17 group [2] - 69:8, 69:14 groups [1] - 69:9 grow [1] - 25:13 growing [1] - 44:21 growth [27] - 27:12, 27:16, 27:17, 27:24, 60:21, 61:14, 62:2, 62:11, 62:16, 63:11, 65:23, 65:24, 66:1, 66:2, 66:3, 66:15, 66:17, 67:7, 67:20, 68:8, 68:9, 68:11, 68:15, 68:17, 69:21, guess [8] - 15:7, 17:3, 19:10, 19:18, 19:19, 47:13, 65:22, 67:11 guessing [1] - 10:23 Gustafson [1] - 1:17 guy [1] - 13:15

Н

half [3] - 9:10, 12:13, 52:23 half-mile [2] - 9:10, 52:23 hand [1] - 54:11 handed [1] - 54:3 handle [1] - 51:21 hands [1] - 34:13 hang [1] - 13:6 HANSON [35] - 1:11, 3:3, 3:21, 4:4, 23:7, 23:17, 23:19, 35:17, 36:1. 36:25. 37:9. 37:14, 37:18, 37:22, 38:4. 38:16. 40:4. 40:9, 41:15, 41:18, 42:4, 57:11, 57:17, 58:3, 58:10, 58:12, 66:10, 68:14, 71:3, 71:9, 71:11, 74:21, 76:6, 76:19, 77:5 Hanson [17] - 2:2, 23:6, 36:24, 38:15, 42:3, 57:10, 57:16, 66:8, 67:13, 68:13, 71:2, 71:10, 74:12, 74:20, 76:5, 76:18, 77:4 Hanson's [2] - 65:5, 74:10 happier [1] - 25:20 happily [1] - 39:25 happy [1] - 51:17

hard [3] - 10:3, 11:8,

29:19

Harrisburg [11] -27:20, 60:13, 60:14, 60:22, 60:23, 61:4, 61:6, 63:2, 67:25, 69:2 hate [1] - 22:22 hazardous [2] - 61:9, 61.12 head [1] - 40:12 health [1] - 27:2 hear [2] - 29:15, 36:17 heard [6] - 17:21, 29:16, 32:21, 35:1, 73:25, 74:24 hearing [17] - 7:7, 7:18, 11:16, 18:18, 18:19, 20:8, 20:11, 20:15, 30:19, 32:6, 34:20, 38:13, 55:22, 66:22, 70:20, 75:2, 76:14 hearings [5] - 8:16, 8:18, 59:13, 72:11, 74:23 heart [1] - 63:10 heavy [1] - 39:18 hello [1] - 13:2 help[1] - 56:11 helpful [2] - 2:20, 13:1 helping [2] - 41:11, 56:25 helps [2] - 12:21, 14:11 Henry [1] - 8:8 herbicides [1] - 54:20 HEREBY [1] - 78:8 high [4] - 61:7, 61:8, 61:11, 61:13 highest [6] - 62:10, 63:10, 67:6, 70:2 highlighting [1] -55:18 highly [4] - 38:25, 39:5, 62:1, 69:9 hindsight [1] - 43:17 **historical** [1] - 5:17 history [3] - 5:1, 8:9, 25:7 hold [1] - 54:8 home [2] - 6:21, 15:2 hook [2] - 35:7, 46:6 hope [2] - 73:8, 75:19 hopefully [2] - 44:24, 47.2 hoping [1] - 55:24 hosting [1] - 31:3 house [5] - 15:12, 19:24, 44:6, 44:9, 44.10

HP14-002 [3] - 1:4,

2:5, 58:4 Hueck [1] - 1:15 huge [1] - 70:8 humanly [1] - 33:19 hundreds [2] - 30:5, 74.24 husband [2] - 18:14, 19:22 ı

identified [1] - 10:15 identifying [1] - 41:7 ignore [2] - 29:19, 29:20 imagine [1] - 61:10 immediate [2] - 66:15, 66:17 impact [5] - 18:1. 29:14, 30:14, 30:25, 68:9 impacted [1] - 29:19 impair [1] - 27:1 **impartial** [1] - 59:17 **imperative** [1] - 26:8 **imperatives** [1] - 34:8 implied [1] - 63:3 implore [1] - 74:15 importance [3] - 25:6, 25:12, 39:2 40:4 important [14] - 24:6, integrity [1] - 45:9 25:3, 26:6, 28:16, intend [3] - 22:12, 30:21, 31:2, 35:4, 42:20, 60:1 40:20, 43:13, 43:15, intent [2] - 41:15, 43:20, 44:22, 45:20, 63:15 46:10 intention [2] - 43:25, impossibility [1] -45:1 48:10 interest [3] - 21:17, impossible [5] -56:13, 73:22 36:18, 39:4, 45:15, interests [2] - 33:11, 47:15, 47:17 74:4 impractical [1] - 39:5 interfere [3] - 27:3, **impress** [1] - 61:3 58:18, 65:18 impression [3] interference [1] - 61:6 30:19, 34:20, 52:8 interfering [2] - 65:13, improvement [1] -66:24 70:15 interpretation [3] -IN [1] - 1:4 65:5, 65:7, 66:12 included [2] - 43:19, Interstate [1] - 32:16 45:5 intervene [2] - 28:7, including [3] - 44:15, 67:24 72:17, 74:17 intervened [1] - 28:2 increase [1] - 62:24 Intervenor [1] - 28:5 incurred [1] - 73:3 intimately [2] - 25:11, independent [4] -33:16 29:12, 29:21, 55:2, investigations [1] -59:11 59:11

independently [1] -

37:13

inviting [1] - 61:19

involved [6] - 29:2,

indicated [3] - 6:23, 32:23, 32:24, 33:1, 33:4, 51:19 20:11, 31:15 individual [3] - 21:23, lowa [1] - 21:16 24:13, 27:9 issue [11] - 11:22, individuals [2] -12:7, 14:16, 17:22, 69:10, 69:11 18:5, 27:11, 46:13, inexpensive [1] - 70:8 51:18, 55:19, 56:10, 65:19 infeasible [1] - 44:4 issued [1] - 26:5 influenced [2] - 69:9, issues [5] - 2:23, 69:15 16:25, 17:17, 27:9, influential [1] - 69:16 71.18 information [3] item [1] - 2:4 37:25, 53:13, 64:2 infrastructure [1] itself [2] - 49:16, 50:2 61:25 inhabitants 161 -26:25, 27:2, 58:16, 58:23 inholding [2] - 8:5, 9:7 initial [3] - 30:24, 44:19, 44:23 injury [2] - 26:23, 58:14 input [5] - 23:2, 24:23, 24:24, 31:15, 36:22 insert [1] - 39:25 inserted [1] - 43:22 instance [3] - 50:1, 61:22, 62:3 instead [2] - 12:5,

James [2] - 6:4, 6:6 **January** [1] - 8:15 job [4] - 41:20, 45:21, 59:12, 59:16 jobs [1] - 30:23 Joey [1] - 50:3 John [2] - 11:24, 63:6 Johnson [4] - 47:25, 48:3, 48:9, 52:4 **Johnson's** [1] - 48:12 joining [1] - 18:16 Joint [2] - 2:12, 76:10 juncture [2] - 68:24, 73:6

K

jurisdiction [1] - 10:12

jurisdictional [3] -

8:22, 8:23, 9:19

Karen [1] - 1:15

Katlyn [1] - 1:17 **KEARNEY** [2] - 3:14, 4:2 Kearney [3] - 1:17, 3:4, 4:4 keep [2] - 37:21, 63:15 keeping [1] - 69:20 Keystone [1] - 3:19 kind [10] - 18:16, 22:19. 31:5. 42:24. 48:10. 49:2. 51:3. 51:20, 51:24, 53:10 knowing [1] - 37:16 knowledge [3] -19:11, 20:17, 20:18 knows [1] - 28:4 Koenecke [3] - 7:22, 39:8, 42:24 KOENECKE [14] -

7:24, 12:8, 12:14,

12:18, 13:11, 39:9, 40:2, 40:7, 40:10, lawn [1] - 16:14 47:16, 47:19, 52:7, laws [3] - 25:24, 53:19, 56:2 26:22, 33:6 Kristen [3] - 1:14, 7:5, 22:23 73:3, 75:13 L lay [1] - 69:24 Leah [1] - 11:7 laid [3] - 26:16, 26:19, 70:11 59:22 land [10] - 5:13, 5:15, 5:17, 7:15, 19:9, 25:8, 25:9, 33:16, 52:25 46:17, 49:4 landfill [3] - 28:9, 68:3, 68:24 landowner [26] - 6:19, 53:8 15:1, 15:15, 17:22, leg [1] - 60:10 28:22, 28:23, 28:25, 33:20, 45:4, 46:16, 26:5, 73:2 46:17, 48:1, 48:8, 48:10, 49:10, 51:16, 51:18, 53:7, 54:19, 55:12, 55:15, 55:20, 56:17, 56:20, 73:1, 74:11 33:13 landowner's [2] -46:25, 56:23 landowners [33] - 5:3, lend [1] - 49:3 5:14, 9:1, 10:25, 11:11, 24:25, 25:4, 39:1, 44:13 25:11, 25:20, 29:16, 30:24, 35:12, 41:9, 24:5 42:14, 43:16, 46:15, less [1] - 14:22 51:6, 51:8, 60:18, 62:20, 62:23, 71:15, 71:17, 71:22, 72:12, 72:13, 72:15, 72:17, 73:2, 73:3, 74:14, 74:17 **Lewis** [1] - 23:8 landowners' [1] - 72:1 lands [1] - 4:25 language [2] - 44:17, 55:21 45.21 large [1] - 33:21 largest [1] - 75:3 Larson [1] - 23:7 last [15] - 8:5, 14:18, 60:23 21:16, 21:21, 23:15, 33:14, 43:6, 44:5, 44:11, 46:12, 57:2, 57:6, 62:22, 69:4, 74:10 lasted [1] - 75:4 Law [4] - 54:25, 58:6,

63:20, 64:16

law [5] - 9:22, 26:16,

33:10, 51:1, 65:8

Lawlor [1] - 63:6 lawsuit [1] - 19:9 lawsuits [3] - 71:23, learning [1] - 34:23 least [3] - 18:6, 18:9, leave [1] - 53:10 leaves [2] - 51:22, leaving [1] - 10:15 **left** [6] - 30:10, 30:13, 32:3, 32:4, 52:8, legal [4] - 7:23, 7:25, legally [4] - 21:9, 21:18, 51:21, 56:15 legislative [1] - 32:18 Legislature [4] -26:20, 33:1, 33:7, legislature [1] - 31:25 legislature's [1] - 10:5 length [3] - 27:18, lengthy [2] - 24:4, lessen [1] - 61:5 lesser[1] - 60:15 level [5] - 16:8, 17:6, 29:10, 32:16, 73:21 liability [1] - 21:6 lifetime [1] - 66:5 light [3] - 7:2, 8:16, lightly [1] - 24:22 **limitations** [1] - 17:20 limited [1] - 65:14 limits [2] - 32:11, Lincoln [4] - 28:6, 65:14, 65:18, 68:1 Linda [2] - 6:18, 8:3 line [16] - 12:5, 13:23, 16:11, 16:20, 18:12, 18:14, 19:13, 40:15, 56:20, 60:11, 61:5, 61:8, 61:13, 68:15, 68:22, 75:20 lines [1] - 70:13

liquids [2] - 61:9, 61:12 list [2] - 8:4, 8:12 listed [1] - 9:5 listened [1] - 29:12 listening [5] - 18:21, 25:2, 26:17, 42:21, 44:1 literature [4] - 49:7, 52:9, 52:15, 54:1 live [2] - 29:9, 75:21 lived [1] - 33:20 lives [3] - 15:24, 30:4 living [3] - 16:1, 17:5, 17.7 **LLC** [2] - 1:4, 2:6 local [12] - 27:6, 27:16, 58:20, 67:18, 67:23, 68:6, 69:7, 73:18, 73:20, 73:23, 73:24, 73:25 locally [2] - 67:19, 67:24 locate [2] - 60:24, 70:7 located [5] - 28:1, 60:9, 60:11, 63:12, 63:13 location [13] - 14:20, 14:23, 16:2, 17:5, 17:15, 18:25, 19:4, 19:6, 20:12, 45:4, 61:8, 62:7, 72:4 locations [2] - 61:21, 66:24 long-term [2] - 30:25, 52:24 look [6] - 10:4, 21:13, 30:22, 31:2, 41:11, 53:20 looked [5] - 27:19, 48:13, 54:2, 56:9 looking [7] - 12:11, 12:15, 14:5, 14:20, 15:11, 29:12, 47:21 looks [3] - 12:4, 13:22, 70:14 loose [1] - 6:14 lose [3] - 48:16, 48:20, 55:10 loses [1] - 49:19 loss [5] - 46:9, 46:10, 51:15, 51:16, 52:16 lost [1] - 53:4 love [2] - 25:9, 33:15

М

magnificent [1] -59:12

Mahmoud [6] - 18:19, 20:10, 22:10, 27:18, 40:11, 49:13 **MAHMOUD** [18] -13:14, 14:4, 14:9, 14:17, 14:24, 15:9, 16:3, 16:10, 16:14, 16:21, 17:8, 22:15, 23:14, 23:18, 40:13, 41:1, 50:5, 54:23 **mail** [12] - 6:15, 6:18, 8:12, 9:16, 9:17, 10:8, 11:23, 12:8, 12:11, 12:16, 12:22, 13:19 mailing [2] - 10:6, 11:3 main [5] - 41:23, 42:8, 43:1, 57:14, 71:6 maintain [8] - 5:4, 40:18, 46:20, 46:25, 49:5, 49:8, 54:15, maintained [3] -44:21. 46:16. 49:4 maintains [2] - 45:9, 49:23 **major** [1] - 75:15 manner [5] - 10:17, 26:9, 34:6, 45:8, 59:17 map [7] - 12:4, 12:11, 12:15, 14:5, 15:2, 15:4, 27:21 maps [1] - 30:1 mass [1] - 39:18 materially [1] - 64:2 mats [2] - 39:17, 39:23 matter [3] - 2:5, 53:21, 78:10 **MATTER** [1] - 1:4 mayor [1] - 63:6 MCCOMSEY [1] - 78:5 McComsey [2] - 1:23, mean [5] - 3:24, 17:18, 44:7, 50:25, 70:16 means [2] - 50:23, 50:24 meant [1] - 39:20 meeting [3] - 11:19, 34:12, 38:23 meetings [1] - 59:17 member [2] - 5:8, 69:14 members [5] - 5:2, 5:22, 5:25, 59:12,

members' [1] - 5:16

memory [1] - 52:7

mentioned [2] - 56:18, 7 56:20 met [3] - 17:12, 17:15, 74:3 methodology [5] -3:15, 32:8, 32:15, 32:17, 55:9 microphone [1] -22:11 middle [6] - 12:1, 12:6, 13:7, 13:20, 14:2 might [20] - 9:2, 13:1, 13:23, 24:4, 29:14, 29:17, 29:18, 30:14, 34:20, 37:8, 40:11, 42:25, 43:4, 44:7, 49:22, 53:10, 54:6, 56:23, 68:8, 68:9 mile [8] - 9:10, 12:5, 13:24, 14:5, 14:22, 15:13, 52:23, 60:23 milepost [2] - 12:12, 12:18 miles [3] - 60:12, 60:25, 68:23 **million** [1] - 32:6 millions [1] - 61:23 mind [3] - 34:12, 52:13, 73:16 minds [1] - 2:24 Minnehaha [3] - 6:19, 65:14.65:18 Minnesota [2] - 50:20, 55:4 minor [1] - 37:23 minute [3] - 13:11, 30:17, 47:8 minutia [1] - 31:10 misleading [1] - 60:6 missed [1] - 11:19 missing [1] - 11:3 mistaken [1] - 3:13 mistakes [1] - 10:1 Moeckly [1] - 35:2 Mohr [1] - 11:7 moment [4] - 14:19, 18:10, 29:3, 47:11 money [1] - 55:14 monitor [4] - 34:18, 34:24, 35:5, 44:13 month [1] - 8:14 most [2] - 25:3, 26:6 mostly [1] - 7:7 mother [1] - 30:4 Motion [2] - 2:12, 76:10 motion [41] - 24:2, 24:8, 24:10, 24:21, 26:7, 35:19, 35:21,

38:12, 38:14, 41:23, 42:6, 42:8, 43:2, 57:13, 57:14, 57:18, 57:19, 57:22, 57:24, 58:1, 58:9, 59:19, 59:20, 60:1, 64:21, 64:24, 67:2, 70:21, 70:23. 71:5. 71:6. 71:8, 71:12, 73:11, 74:7, 74:15, 75:25, 76:8, 76:13, 76:21, 76:22 motions [2] - 2:25, 23:23 move [18] - 2:24, 13:14, 13:24, 23:1, 23:24, 28:18, 36:4, 36:9, 36:14, 36:23, 38:7, 38:10, 43:1, 55:24, 58:4, 70:8, 76:10 moved [9] - 12:4, 13:23, 63:2, 67:9, 68:16, 68:20, 68:22, 76:23, 76:24 moving [1] - 69:21 mower [1] - 16:14 MR [35] - 3:14, 4:2, 4:19, 7:24, 12:8, 12:14, 12:18, 13:11, 13:14, 14:4, 14:9, 14:17, 14:24, 15:9, 16:3, 16:10, 16:14, 16:21, 17:8, 22:15, 23:14, 23:18, 39:9, 40:2, 40:7, 40:10, 40:13, 41:1, 47:16, 47:19, 50:5, 52:7, 53:19, 54:23, 56:2 **MS** [24] - 4:23, 4:24, 5:11, 6:2, 7:5, 11:5, 12:21, 13:2, 13:5, 13:9, 17:24, 18:13, 19:8, 19:18, 20:8, 20:14, 20:21, 20:23, 21:3, 21:13, 22:3, 22:7, 56:12, 65:10 multibillion [3] -62:17, 70:9, 72:8 multiple [1] - 22:16 municipalities [5] -27:17, 60:4, 60:7, 61:17, 67:18 municipality [2] -60:5, 68:18 must [1] - 46:17 mutually [1] - 54:16

Ν

name [4] - 2:1, 8:3, 9:5, 9:7 named [2] - 7:8, 9:2 Nancy [1] - 18:11 nation [1] - 74:5 nationwide [1] - 49:1 nature [1] - 48:2 nay [9] - 38:14, 41:25, 57:7, 70:24, 71:1, 71:4, 76:2, 76:15, 77:1 naysayer [1] - 51:23 near [2] - 15:1, 74:2 nearby [1] - 14:6 nearest [2] - 16:19, nearly [1] - 73:13 necessary [9] - 31:16, 34:25, 42:13, 54:22, 55:16, 62:2, 62:4, 72.2 72.7 need [28] - 4:10, 6:24, 7:3, 11:12, 13:25, 14:2, 14:6, 18:8, 21:23, 27:10, 43:18, 44:6, 44:20, 44:24, 47:9, 48:6, 62:5, 62:7, 62:9, 63:12, 64:8, 64:9, 69:11, 70:5, 70:6, 72:14, 74:18 needed [3] - 29:22, 34:7, 61:20 needs [5] - 21:10, 29:6, 46:11, 67:8, 70:17 negate [1] - 52:6 negotiate [5] - 19:3, 19:4, 20:11, 68:4, 72:16 negotiated [2] - 19:10, 50:12 negotiating [1] - 19:16 negotiation [2] - 19:6, 28:10 negotiations [2] -19:11, 32:24 neighborhood [1] -30:12 neighboring [2] -27:16, 27:24 Nelson [15] - 2:2, 8:20, 10:14, 12:21, 13:3, 38:19, 42:5, 42:10,

43:2, 57:5, 57:12,

71:4, 76:7, 76:20,

77:6

NELSON [91] - 1:11, 2:1, 4:6, 4:22, 5:6, 5:20, 6:7, 7:21, 10:21, 11:20, 12:10, 12:17, 12:20, 13:1, 13:3, 13:6, 13:10, 13:13. 13:18. 14:7. 14:13, 14:18, 15:5, 16:1, 16:4, 16:17, 17:3, 17:21, 18:4, 18:15, 19:15, 20:6, 20:10, 20:19, 20:22, 20:25, 21:4, 21:20, 22:4, 22:10, 22:24, 23:20, 35:24, 36:3, 37:8, 37:11, 37:16, 37:19, 37:24, 38:7, 38:17, 38:19, 38:23, 39:25, 40:24, 41:2, 41:17, 41:21, 42:3, 42:5, 47:13, 47:18, 52:1, 53:9, 54:17, 55:17, 56:6, 57:1, 57:10, 57:12, 57:25, 58:8, 58:11, 64:23, 65:3, 66:9, 67:10, 70:19, 71:2, 71:4, 71:10, 73:10, 74:8, 75:24, 76:5, 76:7, 76:18, 76:20, 76:24, 77:4, 77:6 never [2] - 6:21, 64:12 new [1] - 71:13 next [7] - 6:8, 11:22, 40:11, 40:13, 45:2, 61:7, 61:13 Nichols [5] - 6:18, 7:7, 9:6, 9:14, 11:14 Nichols' [1] - 8:3 night [1] - 7:20 **nilly** [1] - 54:11 **nobody** [3] - 17:7, 18:6, 42:17 noise [4] - 16:23, 17:22, 18:3, 18:5 nomenclature [1] -22:17 none [9] - 24:21, 38:13, 39:7, 41:4, 51:6, 57:5, 59:18, 75:25, 76:14 nonengineer[1] -17:18 nonissue [1] - 17:7 nonnegotiable [1] -26:8 nonnegotiables [1] -34.8 nontribal [1] - 5:8

Nortec [2] - 66:25,

72:17 North [1] - 48:23 Notary [2] - 78:7, 78:18 note [2] - 12:15, 27:25 **noted** [1] - 30:3 notes [1] - 37:1 nothing [5] - 9:8, 28:11, 51:18, 64:1, 70:11 notice [18] - 7:4, 7:17, 7:23, 7:25, 8:8, 8:24, 9:1, 9:10, 9:20, 9:22, 9:23, 10:17, 10:20, 11:8, 11:9, 11:13, 11:15, 25:17 notices [1] - 10:3 notification [3] - 6:22, 46:20, 46:24 notify [2] - 46:14, 46:18 **notion** [1] - 9:9 November [3] - 1:8, 20:24, 78:11 nuances [1] - 10:16 number [15] - 3:15, 3:18, 3:22, 4:1, 26:21, 26:22, 27:1, 27:3, 34:3, 40:5, 42:14, 48:25, 50:3, 62:23, 66:4 numbers [1] - 48:22 numerous [3] - 71:16, 74:23

0

object [1] - 68:22 objection [2] - 22:4, 22:7 **objective** [1] - 59:10 **obligations** [1] - 21:18 observation [1] - 30:8 observations [1] -40:19 observe [1] - 40:21 obstruction [1] - 14:1 obtain [1] - 56:1 **obtaining** [1] - 72:6 **obvious** [3] - 13:16, 27:12, 45:5 obviously [4] - 10:23, 21:17, 45:14, 67:13 occasionally [1] -69:11 occupied [1] - 16:20 October [5] - 6:18, 11:23, 12:16, 19:21, 63:7

OF [6] - 1:2, 1:4, 1:4, 78:1, 78:3 offer [3] - 35:10, 42:9, 68:1 offering [1] - 24:9 officials [3] - 67:19, 67:24, 69:11 onboard [1] - 39:22 once [2] - 53:22, 64:6 one [33] - 2:4, 3:4, 7:8, 10:19, 11:3, 11:25, 15:1, 22:8, 25:16, 26:21, 27:14, 28:5, 28:21, 28:25, 29:11, 30:3, 34:3, 35:18, 37:6, 40:11, 40:13, 42:21, 42:25, 43:4, 47:22, 48:23, 50:1, 51:14, 59:23, 62:18, 63:9, 67:14, 76:9 ones [1] - 69:20 Onida [1] - 78:13 online [5] - 18:21, 25:2, 42:20, 42:21, 44:1 open [6] - 2:24, 22:12, 23:22, 38:25, 39:2, 75:5 opened [1] - 53:5 opens [1] - 51:2 **operating** [1] - 34:6 operation [3] - 32:5. 45:13. 46:22 opinion [1] - 11:9 **opponent** [1] - 69:19 **opportune** [1] - 57:18 opportunity [10] -24:3, 24:13, 24:17, 36:10, 36:15, 42:22, 45:20, 53:18, 68:18, 73:7 opposed [10] - 38:14, 41:24, 48:5, 57:7, 69:21, 70:24, 74:24, 76:2, 76:15, 76:25 opposing [1] - 73:3 opposition [3] - 74:1, 75:10 option [8] - 43:12, 60:12, 60:14, 60:15, 60:16, 60:24, 61:1, 61:2 **options** [1] - 60:8 order [3] - 38:24, 57:23, 72:23 orderly [2] - 27:4,

58:18

organic [34] - 46:13,

46:16, 46:17, 46:21,

46:25, 47:21, 47:23,

48:3, 48:5, 48:8, 49:3, 49:5, 49:9, 49:12, 49:15, 50:18, 50:19, 50:21, 50:23, 51:7, 51:9, 51:14, 51:15, 52:6, 53:22, 53:25, 54:5, 54:7, 54:9. 54:15. 55:5. 55:6, 55:24, 56:10 organization [1] - 52:4 original [5] - 33:18, 45:9, 64:1, 64:3, 64:4 originally [2] - 49:10, 70:13 ought [2] - 34:14, 44:9 ourselves [1] - 37:4 out-of-state [1] - 72:8 outset [1] - 24:15 outside [2] - 32:25, 68:20 outstanding [1] - 2:24 overall [1] - 17:3 overlooked [1] - 58:24 oversee [1] - 44:23 own [8] - 7:15, 24:9, 44:10, 49:1, 59:7, 59:23, 71:21, 72:19 owned [1] - 52:22 owner [2] - 8:5, 33:11 owns [5] - 7:16, 17:13, 18:7, 53:7

Ρ

p.m [1] - 10:15 package [3] - 35:13, 35:14, 36:22 padding [1] - 56:24 page [10] - 12:15, 37:25, 39:13, 40:5, 43:10, 43:21, 44:1, 44:11, 68:25 pager [1] - 42:19 pages [3] - 36:7, 37:1, 38:5 paid [5] - 31:5, 35:5, 49:11, 50:12, 56:23 **Pandora's** [1] - 51:3 paper [1] - 11:8 paragraph [4] - 46:12, 47:21, 57:3, 57:7 paragraphs [1] - 21:23 parameters [1] - 55:11 paramount [1] - 60:9 paraphrase [1] - 63:22 parcel [19] - 8:7, 9:2, 9:5, 46:15, 46:17, 46:19, 46:21, 46:25,

47:22, 48:3, 48:8, permanent [1] - 49:18 48:17, 48:20, 49:4, permeates [2] - 69:6, 49:5, 49:8, 53:25, 54:5, 54:15 permission [4] - 5:10, parcels [2] - 29:24, 46:13 permit [19] - 2:6, 2:9, parent [1] - 21:5 part [7] - 17:9, 33:22, 33:23, 44:15, 49:24, 63:22. 75:19 partially [1] - 55:24 particular [9] - 5:8, 9:2, 28:12, 30:11, **PERMIT** [1] - 1:5 36:22, 39:6, 48:21, permutations [1] -54:24, 70:1 particularly [5] - 4:12, person [4] - 10:20, 6:6, 27:19, 35:12, 41:9 personality [1] - 69:13 parties [6] - 2:18, personally [3] - 17:12, 2:19, 36:10, 59:1, 59:6, 75:16 perspective [4] parts [1] - 67:4 party [3] - 34:17, 34:23, 44:13 perspectives [1] pass [1] - 42:24 passed [1] - 55:5 petroleum [2] - 26:13, passes [2] - 26:7, 74:15 phone [3] - 7:10, 32:8, passionate [1] - 24:24 past [2] - 5:23, 75:1 phrase [3] - 37:3, pasture [3] - 46:8, 46:9. 55:23 pick [3] - 10:7, 10:11, path [3] - 28:23, 61:14, 62:1 picking [1] - 28:24 paths [1] - 54:16 piece [2] - 9:21, 15:16 pay [2] - 31:1, 49:15 **pieces** [1] - 9:16 payments [1] - 30:24 pipe [3] - 14:10, 49:20, pennies [2] - 62:16, 70:10 **PIPELINE** [1] - 1:5 people [26] - 8:24, **Pipeline** [3] - 2:7, 3:9, 9:13, 9:24, 10:7, 10:10, 12:23, 31:3, pipeline [54] - 2:10, 31:8, 35:11, 44:8, 44:10, 49:1, 61:11, 61:23, 66:23, 69:14, 69:16, 69:18, 72:21, 74:4, 75:4, 75:6, 75:7, 75:8 perceive [2] - 29:17, 69:10 perceived [1] - 69:17 percent [4] - 50:9, 50:10, 51:5, 51:8

perfect [2] - 18:25,

perhaps [3] - 11:3,

period [3] - 20:12,

52:17, 54:21

periods [1] - 44:4

25:3, 74:9

36:3

69:8

6:1, 71:25, 72:1

14:13, 20:5, 23:24,

63:21, 63:23, 64:1,

64:4, 70:22, 71:7,

71:24, 72:4, 72:7,

18:6, 44:18, 44:20

22:12, 34:21, 36:21,

19:12, 20:16

73:1, 76:1

49:25

40:20

22:25

30:2

73:14

28:21

70:12

62:4

5:22, 5:25, 6:20,

7:16, 11:24, 18:24,

19:7, 19:23, 25:18,

26:7, 26:12, 27:11,

27:15, 27:23, 28:1,

28:4, 28:14, 29:14,

29:24, 30:6, 30:8,

30:22, 31:3, 45:13,

46:4, 52:5, 53:2,

53:17, 60:5, 60:8,

60:24, 61:9, 61:12,

62:7, 62:9, 62:15,

62:17, 62:21, 63:15,

63:17, 64:7, 64:11,

66:4, 67:21, 68:3,

72:5, 74:25, 75:8,

75:11, 75:15

64:13, 64:14, 64:15,

43:11, 45:2

26:5, 58:4, 60:2,

pipeline's [1] - 63:5 pipelines [7] - 30:2, 30:3. 32:16. 55:8. 59:21, 59:25, 61:17 place [3] - 34:4, 39:15, 51.8 placed [3] - 15:20, 42:20, 49:20 placement [1] - 13:25 placement's [1] -12:12 placements [1] - 12:1 places [2] - 39:12, 46:9 plan [9] - 21:24, 21:25, 22:1, 22:9, 22:18, 22:19, 22:21, 35:18 planned [1] - 30:10 **plans** [1] - 20:2 plant [1] - 5:8 plants [4] - 4:13, 4:17, 5:23, 6:1 play [2] - 34:18, 74:9 plopped [1] - 13:20 plot [1] - 19:17 plots [3] - 18:24, 19:1 pockets [1] - 56:24 point [14] - 2:17, 2:21, 16:14, 23:22, 24:18, 25:21, 33:14, 34:15, 42:7, 42:17, 45:24, 53:3, 66:6, 67:16 pointed [1] - 73:23 points [3] - 65:23, 67:11, 67:12 pole [1] - 56:13 policy [2] - 32:14, 63:3 populated [3] - 62:1, 62:10, 63:10 population [2] - 67:7, 70:3 **portion** [1] - 25:18 pose [2] - 26:23, 58:14 position [4] - 9:19, 50:25, 70:16, 73:17 possible [5] - 29:24, 33:19, 35:14, 36:6, 45:17 posted [1] - 47:10 posting [1] - 47:7 potential [6] - 27:11, 29:4, 29:18, 30:14, 35:1, 66:1 potentially [1] - 71:18 power [3] - 61:5, 61:8, 61:13 practical [1] - 50:10 practicalities [1] practically [1] - 51:21

practice [2] - 51:14, 63:8 practices [1] - 5:5 preceding [1] - 57:22 prefer [1] - 57:22 prepared [1] - 69:1 prerogative [1] - 33:12 prescribed [1] - 55:9 present [1] - 73:6 presented [6] - 26:1, 37:15. 38:3. 59:6. 61:7. 64:3 preserving [1] - 25:8 pressure [2] - 61:8, 61:12 pretty [6] - 12:2, 12:13, 15:11, 28:4, 40:19, 45:18 prevent [1] - 5:22 previous [1] - 71:12 previously [1] - 63:23 prices [1] - 54:9 private [2] - 4:18, 4:25 problem [5] - 14:12, 21:3, 39:24, 50:8, 75:15 **problems** [1] - 35:1 proceed [7] - 2:15, 2:17, 35:23, 36:1, 36:9, 50:2, 70:21 proceeding [2] -53:12, 77:8 proceedings [7] -8:25, 9:21, 10:18, 59:14, 78:9, 78:12 Proceedings [1] - 1:7 process [17] - 8:13, 9:20, 11:1, 11:4, 24:5, 24:23, 25:16, 26:4, 34:18, 39:24, 42:16, 64:9, 67:25, 72:7, 74:22, 75:19 producing [2] - 26:11, 34:2 products [1] - 26:14 Professional [2] -78:6, 78:19 professional [2] -59:2, 73:6 project [12] - 4:1, 33:11, 33:21, 34:4, 36:19, 39:6, 39:15, 47:23, 53:2, 58:5, 70:9, 75:20 proof [6] - 26:15, 58:6, 58:13, 63:21, 63:25, 65:17 proper [15] - 6:22, 7:3, 7:23, 7:25, 32:17, 34:3, 34:4, 34:5,

34:7, 34:13, 34:15, 14:22, 15:7, 15:20, 76:12 read [3] - 13:11, regain [2] - 53:18, 43:25, 45:4, 50:13 15:23, 16:8 51:20, 52:8 55:16 requesting [1] - 71:25 properly [5] - 33:10, purchase [1] - 15:16 readily [1] - 53:14 regard [2] - 17:22, requests [1] - 52:10 37:3, 45:12, 46:2, purchased [1] - 15:20 66:25 reading [3] - 49:7, require [2] - 30:9, 64:7 purposely [1] - 54:20 52:14, 54:1 regarding [5] - 2:12, 31:22 properties [4] - 29:5, purposes [1] - 50:10 readings [1] - 17:10 19:11, 63:21, 64:3, required [3] - 10:3, 60:19, 72:6, 75:1 pursuant [1] - 2:11 reads [1] - 58:12 76:10 11:8, 46:20 property [27] - 4:18, purview [2] - 32:19, Real [1] - 4:8 regardless [1] - 9:8 requirement [2] -5:4, 5:9, 11:25, region [2] - 27:4, 9:12, 10:7 real [3] - 15:2, 41:19, 15:14, 15:16, 16:25, put [11] - 8:6, 11:9, 59.15 58:19 reroute [1] - 61:24 17:9, 18:7, 25:12, 12:5, 17:1, 18:24, **REAL** [2] - 4:19, 4:23 Registered [2] - 78:5, rerouting [1] - 62:15 29:14, 29:17, 30:18, 78:19 19:17, 25:18, 28:2, really [9] - 4:21, 5:7, research [1] - 54:13 30:25, 31:5, 31:10, regret [2] - 10:19, 44:17, 52:5, 53:16 30:24. 31:2. 31:4. residence [5] - 10:14, 32:5, 33:11, 33:18, putting [1] - 51:7 50:23. 50:25. 51:11. 75:21 14:21, 16:20, 17:13, 33:21, 50:14, 52:12, 67:17 reimburse [1] - 73:2 20:16 53:7, 53:18, 66:25, Q Realtime [2] - 78:6, reiteration [1] - 67:12 residential [1] - 60:20 72:9, 72:21 78:19 related [1] - 68:3 resides [1] - 7:1 proposed [14] - 3:6, reapplication [3] relationships [2] - 5:3, resolve [3] - 28:10, quagmire [1] - 53:10 3:20, 5:24, 6:20, 63:20, 63:24, 64:2 5:18 32:18, 71:17 quantitative [1] -26:21, 41:3, 41:4, relative [2] - 62:15, reapply [1] - 65:16 resolved [2] - 2:8, 29:21 43:3, 57:3, 58:5, reason [7] - 11:7, 64:21 14:16 quantitatively [1] -62:5, 62:21, 62:23, 11:10, 22:14, 24:10, release [1] - 19:22 resources [1] - 5:15 29:13 54:7, 63:1, 75:12 reliability [1] - 31:16 respect [2] - 66:7, quarter [11] - 8:6, proposing [2] - 43:7, reasonable [2] relieve [1] - 69:2 73:5 12:5, 13:23, 14:5, 44:2 remainder [1] - 65:19 46:23, 72:2 response [10] - 5:6, 14:22, 38:21, 49:18, protect [6] - 14:6, reasoning [1] - 11:6 remaining [1] - 51:6 11:21, 19:2, 21:24, 49:19, 52:22, 53:1, 42:14. 56:19. 64:19. reasons [1] - 54:8 21:25, 22:1, 22:9, remarks [2] - 64:20, 60:22 69:3, 69:23 receive [4] - 7:10, 22:17, 22:19, 22:21 75:19 questioned [1] - 27:18 protected [1] - 10:25 7:23, 7:25, 15:22 responsibility [4] remember [6] - 3:13, questions [24] - 2:8, protecting [1] - 46:24 64:18, 69:3, 69:23, received [9] - 2:17, 15:1, 15:10, 15:18, 2:23, 3:2, 4:6, 6:13, protection [2] - 35:11, 6:16, 7:3, 11:23, 16:9, 21:15 71:20 13:7, 18:5, 18:17, 69:4 responsible [3] - 45:7, 18:1, 18:2, 20:15, reminder [1] - 29:6 18:22, 21:1, 21:5, protections [1] - 41:8 32:7, 73:14 45:11, 46:1 remove [4] - 44:3, 21:15, 23:3, 23:5, prove [3] - 64:8, receiving [5] - 7:12, restoration [2] -54:17, 57:2, 61:24 23:21, 27:14, 48:18, 65:17, 73:7 25:17, 60:2, 71:24, removing [1] - 44:5 44:16, 46:9 49:25, 52:2, 53:4, provide [3] - 9:4, return [1] - 10:13 renegotiate [1] - 50:16 53:14, 56:7, 59:10, 31:14, 35:10 receptor [1] - 16:23 returns [1] - 33:17 renter [1] - 55:20 75:9 provided [7] - 31:17, recess [10] - 36:9, repair [4] - 34:7, revenue [1] - 31:11 quick [1] - 15:3 31:20, 35:14, 37:12, 36:14, 36:16, 38:11, Revenue [5] - 31:13. 45:15, 45:17, 52:11 quickly [2] - 4:21, 43:16, 43:20, 59:22 38:12, 38:14, 38:20, 31:21, 31:22, 32:1, repaired [1] - 45:18 26:10 providing [2] - 59:10, 38:22, 47:10, 47:12 32:9 repairing [1] - 45:7 quite [3] - 15:15, 26:3, 64.1 reclamation [9] - 26:9, review [3] - 36:11, repairs [1] - 45:11 57:19 **provisions** [1] - 41:8 33:14, 33:17, 33:21, 36:15, 39:15 repeat [1] - 12:18 **Public** [4] - 32:23, 34:3, 34:16, 44:19, reviewed [1] - 39:10 repeatedly [1] - 72:13 R 64:12, 78:7, 78:18 44:24, 46:22 **RICHARD** [1] - 1:12 replacement [1] public [5] - 5:14, recommend [1] - 36:6 rights [7] - 4:11, 5:1, 45:11 11:16, 26:17, 32:14, $\pmb{\text{record}}\ [3]\ \textbf{-}\ 9\text{:}4,\ 28\text{:}3,$ railroads [2] - 59:21, 5:4, 5:19, 10:25, replacing [1] - 45:7 35:4 53:11 33:11, 72:9 61:22 Reported [1] - 1:23 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:10 red [1] - 43:5 raised [1] - 27:14 Rislov [1] - 1:16 **Reporter** [4] - 78:6, publish [3] - 9:11, redundancy [2] - 11:6, raises [1] - 67:13 River [2] - 6:4, 6:6 78:19, 78:19 10:4, 10:6 11:10 ramifications [1] road [1] - 14:21 reporter [1] - 78:9 publishes [1] - 9:11 reestablishment [1] rods [3] - 52:23, 74.25 reprehensible [1] publishing [1] - 10:5 34:7 52:24, 53:1 ran [1] - 56:13 71:24 **PUC** [8] - 7:11, 24:1, **reference** [3] - 15:4, Rolayne [2] - 1:14, rancher [1] - 33:15 representatives [2] -25:23, 26:19, 28:17, 16:15, 40:5 59:15 ranchers [2] - 26:10, 31:11, 58:25 34:10, 34:21, 38:23 references [2] - 22:16, 34:1 represented [2] - 56:3, role [1] - 34:18 **PUCs** [1] - 33:3 71:16 room [2] - 18:20, 25:1 rappold [1] - 66:20 59:2 pull [4] - 4:20, 14:24, referencing [1] - 40:14 rose [1] - 29:10 rather [1] - 30:10 representing [2] -15:2, 15:10 refuel [1] - 52:12 Rounds [1] - 1:16 raw [3] - 39:20, 39:21, 6:11, 7:22 pump [6] - 14:19, **refuses** [1] - 31:14 40:1 rounds [1] - 2:18 requested [2] - 2:13,

10

44:24 75:18, 78:7 route [24] - 5:25, 6:20, show [1] - 72:14 sort [4] - 49:16, 52:18, 11 showed [2] - 27:22, 27:11, 28:20, 42:14, secondly [3] - 12:4, 61:15, 69:17 STATE [2] - 1:2, 78:1 49:14, 60:8, 60:12, 51:5, 67:23 sounds [3] - 3:24, state [12] - 3:17, 9:22, 60.18 60:20, 60:22, 61:4, 14:25.66:20 26:16, 33:18, 47:1, section [5] - 8:7, **showing** [1] - 30:1 61:7, 62:14, 62:19, 49:19, 52:22, 53:1 50:20, 55:1, 55:8, **shown** [3] - 71:19, sources [1] - 53:21 62:21, 62:23, 63:1, see [13] - 6:9, 25:1, 71:22, 73:4 **SOUTH** [2] - 1:2, 78:1 65:8, 67:4, 67:8, 63:5, 63:9, 64:11, 43:5, 43:6, 44:21, **shrugged** [1] - 52:18 south [2] - 27:20, 72:8 64:15, 65:8, 65:12, 47:14, 49:21, 54:14, Sibsons [1] - 35:2 28:15 **State's** [1] - 33:10 65:19 66:2, 67:5, 69:19, sides [2] - 46:24, 59:8 South [36] - 10:25, statement [1] - 71:11 routed [3] - 28:14, 69:24, 75:15 sign [1] - 19:22 23:8, 25:14, 25:19, states [4] - 32:4, 33:3, 64:7, 66:16 seeing [3] - 41:4, 57:5, signed [4] - 49:10, 25:25, 28:22, 30:23, 58:22, 63:22 routes [1] - 65:9 75:25 30:25, 31:3, 31:8, stating [1] - 61:17 56:3, 56:21, 56:25 routing [9] - 27:19, segregation [1] -35:6, 35:12, 41:9, station [6] - 14:19, significantly [1] -27:22, 28:4, 28:10, 43:12 50:9, 50:21, 54:25, 14:23, 15:7, 15:21, 62:22 28:17, 62:9, 64:13, selling [1] - 17:9 58:5, 62:11, 63:11, 15:23, 16:8 silence [4] - 28:11, 64:14, 67:21 send [7] - 8:4, 8:24, 63:19, 64:16, 64:19, status [2] - 50:16, 69:2, 70:1, 73:25 row [2] - 43:22, 43:23 9:1, 9:4, 9:10, 9:15, 66:5, 70:3, 71:14, 55:16 silent [2] - 68:7, 73:24 **RPR** [1] - 1:23 71:23, 72:3, 72:9, statute [4] - 9:3, 11:6, **similar** [2] - 37:7, rule [1] - 51:24 74:5, 74:11, 74:23, 11:9, 54:25 sense [5] - 3:1, 18:25, 60:14 rules [2] - 26:22, 35:22, 43:24, 50:7 75:10, 75:18, 78:7, statutes [1] - 55:5 simple [2] - 19:5, 25:9 57:23 78:13 sensitive [3] - 16:23, **statutory** [5] - 27:13, simply [15] - 26:3, run [2] - 12:22, 61:18 **space** [2] - 30:6, 30:11 18:5, 18:23 28:19, 29:7, 30:15, 31:18, 31:25, 36:18, speaking [1] - 66:20 running [1] - 59:16 sent [1] - 9:8 37:21, 39:5, 41:6, 64:10 specifically [3] rural [2] - 23:11, 25:14 sentence [1] - 44:5 stay [1] - 51:3 43:25, 50:21, 52:5, 36:16, 37:19, 39:3 Rural [1] - 23:9 sentences [1] - 45:6 stemmed [1] - 49:11 53:4, 60:2, 66:16, separately [1] - 24:10 **specify** [1] - 55:6 70:8, 70:17 step [1] - 34:25 spend [4] - 24:19, S **September** [1] - 8:18 simultaneously [1] stewards [1] - 74:6 series [2] - 13:7, 18:16 27:8, 29:3, 30:17 still [13] - 5:12, 12:8, 3.23 serious 151 - 14:15. spent [3] - 31:9, 45:25, 46:6, 48:15, single [1] - 9:21 safer [3] - 59:21, 59:25 43:13, 61:24 26:23, 29:8, 30:15, 48:20, 49:23, 52:15, **Sioux** [15] - 2:14, 4:9, safety [2] - 27:2, 40:20 **sphere** [1] - 68:20 58:14 4:12, 4:16, 27:21, 52:20, 61:23, 69:23, sagging [1] - 45:24 spoken [3] - 7:14, serve [1] - 8:24 73:7 28:6, 28:8, 28:15, sandbags [1] - 46:3 9:25. 12:24 served [5] - 8:23, 30:2, 47:24, 60:11, stipulated [4] - 2:12, sat [1] - 30:18 Spotted [1] - 6:2 17:1, 24:1, 76:11 10:12, 10:14, 19:8, 68:2, 68:22, 75:2, satisfied [2] - 21:14, spreads [6] - 3:9, 20:23 76:12 **Stipulated** [8] - 16:18, 53.7 3:10, 3:15, 3:18, service [2] - 8:4, 10:13 sit [4] - 8:14, 9:6, 21:22, 24:16, 34:9, Sattgast [12] - 2:3, 3:22, 4:1 set [4] - 37:20, 42:9, 28:17, 54:12 34:11, 34:14, 35:8, 16:5, 38:17, 42:1, squarely [1] - 33:12 64:15, 71:15 siting [4] - 10:10, 56:10 57:8, 64:25, 65:21, SS [1] - 78:2 26:25, 58:16, 72:4 stipulation [2] - 21:22, settled [1] - 55:14 70:25, 73:12, 76:3, **STAFF** [1] - 1:13 44:15 settlement [1] - 68:4 sits [1] - 14:10 76:16, 77:2 staff [12] - 3:20, 7:5, stipulations [1] situation [8] - 7:1, several [7] - 4:7, 7:6, SATTGAST [16] -15:10, 18:22, 21:10, 7:9, 7:10, 16:19, 23:10 24:9, 32:8, 56:13, 1:12, 16:6, 16:12, 48:6, 56:19, 70:1, 24:1, 34:10, 47:6, Stofferahn [5] - 6:11, 59:11, 66:23 16:16, 38:18, 42:2, shall [10] - 2:8, 2:11, 74:17 56:9, 59:9, 59:12, 13:4, 18:11, 18:14, 57:9, 65:1, 65:4, 65:2 2:15, 45:3, 45:7, **six** [1] - 73:18 74:17 65:20, 71:1, 73:13, stand [2] - 18:19, 67:9 STOFFERAHN [11] -45:10, 46:14, 48:4, skilled [1] - 59:17 76:4, 76:17, 76:23, standard [8] - 16:22, 13:2, 13:5, 13:9, 63:24, 65:5 **skip** [1] - 9:14 77:3 26:19, 26:20, 27:7, 18:13, 19:8, 19:18, share [8] - 5:24, slash [2] - 39:16, Sattgast's [1] - 66:14 29:9, 47:18, 50:18, 10:24, 25:10, 37:4, 20:8, 20:14, 20:21, 39:22 save [1] - 54:4 50:20 20:23, 21:3 37:5, 50:4, 74:11 slope [2] - 45:5, 45:10 saved [1] - 69:12 sheriff [1] - 8:24 **standpoint** [2] - 66:15, **stop** [3] - 30:9, 60:1, social [2] - 26:24, saw [2] - 5:8, 38:4 sheriff's [1] - 10:13 58:15 67:8 63:17 scale [1] - 33:21 start [3] - 29:6, 35:9, **story** [5] - 25:4, 25:5, shoes [1] - 13:21 sole [2] - 28:8, 68:2 scheduled [1] - 11:24 55:12 25:9, 25:10 short [3] - 38:22, solely [1] - 47:21 schools [1] - 31:6 started [1] - 15:22 stream [1] - 14:6 47:10, 47:12 solve [1] - 55:13 **SDCL** [1] - 2:11 **starting** [1] - 34:15 **stripping** [1] - 34:5 shortcomings [1] sometimes [2] season [1] - 44:21 starts [2] - 34:3, 48:4 strong [1] - 45:21 75:20 17:18, 73:21 seating [1] - 75:6 State [9] - 25:24, struck [1] - 43:22 shortest [1] - 62:14 **somewhere** [1] - 75:3 second [5] - 4:20, 26:20, 35:11, 50:9, **structure** [1] - 15:11 **shorthand** [2] - 78:9 sophomorically [1] -37:20, 40:15, 42:9, 70:3, 74:23, 75:10, struggle [2] - 68:7, shot [1] - 60:9 70:14

68:9 stuck [1] - 51:25 stuff [1] - 20:3 sub [7] - 37:25, 39:14, 40:8, 40:25, 43:10, 44:2, 44:5 Sub [1] - 44:12 subject [3] - 40:14, 49:14, 51:9 submit [1] - 11:18 subpoena [1] - 19:8 subsection [3] -58:17, 58:22 subsequent [2] -41:16, 66:25 subsequently [1] -68:25 subset [1] - 40:13 **substantial** [4] - 9:13, 29:8, 30:16, 39:18 substantially [3] -10:18, 27:1, 54:9 substitute [6] - 35:19, 58:9, 64:24, 70:21, 70:23, 71:5 succeeding [1] -54:19 success [1] - 33:23 sudden [1] - 69:22 sue [1] - 72:14 sued [2] - 19:18, 73:1 suggest [1] - 65:9 suggesting [1] - 13:14 suggestion [1] - 28:13 suing [3] - 72:2, 72:12, 72:13 **SULLY** [1] - 78:3 sum [1] - 47:2 sunk [1] - 17:16 support [5] - 31:6, 39:16, 39:18, 39:22, supporting [1] - 74:7 surprised [1] - 15:23 surprisingly [1] - 61:6 survey [3] - 19:22, 71:25, 72:6 surveys [1] - 71:25 suspect [2] - 72:16, 75:16 swayed [1] - 73:21 sympathize [1] - 56:18 system [1] - 75:18 systems [1] - 23:11 T

table [1] - 19:4 talent [2] - 41:19,

59:16 talks [1] - 12:23 tax [1] - 30:18 taxation [2] - 31:10, 32:16 taxes [3] - 30:25, 31:5, 32:5 taxpayer [1] - 9:4 taxpayers [1] - 35:6 **Tea** [8] - 60:14, 60:16, 60:21, 60:23, 63:2, 63:6, 67:25, 68:16 technical [3] - 17:17, 22:18. 22:20 technically [1] - 59:17 telephone [1] - 6:10 tenant [3] - 48:9, 51:17, 56:25 term [6] - 21:24, 21:25, 22:5, 30:25, 52:24 terminology [1] -22:13 terrific [1] - 59:16 territory [2] - 4:14, 4:17 test [3] - 18:24, 18:25, 19:17 testified [10] - 31:12, 55:22, 59:24, 60:4, 60:7, 62:6, 62:18, 62:25, 63:12, 70:6 **testify** [1] - 6:3 testimony [19] - 16:7, 23:8, 25:6, 27:20, 28:13, 29:10, 29:13, 29:15, 29:16, 29:19, 29:21, 29:23, 45:15, 45:16, 60:18, 66:18, 66:22, 67:5, 75:9 **THE** [6] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, 1:5, 1:10 themselves [4] - 49:3, 59:1, 69:12, 73:8 they've [3] - 19:14, 20:17, 70:11 thinking [5] - 3:12, 33:5, 37:6, 39:21, 61:11 third [3] - 34:17, 34:23, 44:13 third-party [3] - 34:17, 34:23, 44:13 thoroughly [2] -21:14, 26:17 thoughts [1] - 49:13 threat [2] - 26:23, 58:14

three [20] - 3:10, 19:9,

22:2, 24:21, 27:1,

29:7, 37:12, 46:10, 51:15, 51:24, 52:16, 52:17, 52:20, 52:23, 53:17, 53:20, 53:23, 54:21, 67:14, 68:25 three-year [2] - 52:16, 54:21 throughout [5] - 22:5, 26:3, 42:15, 46:21, 72.11 thumbs [2] - 24:13 tied [1] - 5:12 ties [2] - 5:17 tile [10] - 34:7, 45:8, 45:10, 45:12, 45:15, 45:16, 45:17, 45:23, 46:1, 46:4 timber [6] - 39:16, 39:17, 39:20, 39:21, 39:23, 40:1 timbers [1] - 39:18 title [1] - 22:18 **TO** [1] - 1:5 today [5] - 2:4, 2:8, 26:6, 28:18, 54:12 together[1] - 14:16 token [1] - 29:20 **Tom** [1] - 18:14 took [3] - 15:6, 56:12, 78:9 top [2] - 43:10, 43:21 topsoil [2] - 34:5, 43:12 totally [1] - 72:1 toward [1] - 34:15 towards [3] - 18:18, 55:24, 59:18

township [1] - 31:6

tract [2] - 14:12, 49:11

track [1] - 18:8

tracts [1] - 50:9

trade [1] - 14:7

trade-off [1] - 14:7

traditions [1] - 5:5

trampling [1] - 72:8

TransCanada [1] -

Transcript [1] - 1:7

transcription [1] -

traverses [1] - 28:2

tribal [5] - 4:11, 5:2,

5:16, 5:22, 5:25

Tribe [3] - 4:9, 4:12,

tried [2] - 10:2, 61:3

trivial [1] - 72:10

trucks [1] - 59:21

true [2] - 68:15, 78:11

Troy [1] - 23:7

3:19

78:12

4:16

try [3] - 9:14, 35:3, 36:25 trying [10] - 3:8, 15:9, 15:18, 16:6, 35:18, 35:19, 37:3, 37:7, 51:3, 66:7 turn [2] - 26:15, 56:9 two [14] - 2:18, 3:12, 26:22, 35:9, 39:12, 40:22, 41:12, 45:6, 46:9, 47:11, 52:12, 60:15, 67:11, 67:17 type [1] - 61:25 types [1] - 17:18 typically [1] - 73:21 U

unable [2] - 11:17, 56:2 unanswered [1] - 6:12 uncomfortable [2] -22:13, 36:13 under [8] - 6:16, 9:22, 37:25, 52:10, 52:11, 60:6, 63:19, 64:15 underneath [1] - 46:3 understood [2] -44:14, 48:21 unduly [7] - 27:3, 29:8, 30:16, 58:18, 65:13, 65:17, 68:10 unforgiving [1] - 54:6 unfortunate [1] - 10:1 unfortunately [1] -11:17 uninhibited [1] - 26:12 unintendedly [1] -50:15 units [4] - 27:6, 58:20, 67:23, 68:6 universal [1] - 63:8 unless [3] - 21:23, 22:13, 62:2 unmolested [1] - 53:2 unusual [3] - 24:8, 36:12, 38:25 unworkable [1] -36:18 **up** [27] - 2:22, 4:20. 6:14, 10:7, 10:11, 11:22, 12:8, 14:24, 15:2, 15:10, 15:18, 16:17, 22:23, 24:13, 25:13, 34:11, 39:2, 42:20, 42:22, 44:22, 47:17, 51:2, 53:5, 56:13, 59:24, 73:5, 75:5

V

valuable [1] - 34:18

value [1] - 29:17 valve [5] - 12:1, 12:12, 13:15, 13:20, 13:25 variety [1] - 71:17 verbally [1] - 43:19 verified [1] - 32:7 view [5] - 8:22, 9:9, 9:23, 10:5, 24:17 views [3] - 27:5, 58:20, 68:6 violate [1] - 30:15 virtue [1] - 48:16 visual [3] - 15:17, 18:1, 40:18 visually [1] - 40:21 voice [1] - 73:20 **voids** [1] - 9:20 voltage [2] - 61:7, 61:13 vote [6] - 41:24, 70:21, 70:24, 76:1, 76:14, 76:25 votes [7] - 38:19, 42:5, 57:12, 71:4, 76:7, 76:20, 77:6

W

walked [1] - 47:17 wants [3] - 6:14, 42:23, 56:1 Water [1] - 23:9 water [1] - 23:11 wave [1] - 69:10 ways [1] - 44:8 website [2] - 47:7, 54:3 week [3] - 21:16, 23:15, 23:16 weeks [1] - 19:9 weighed [1] - 67:17 weight [1] - 68:5 welcome [1] - 40:10 welding [1] - 52:10

welfare [1] - 27:2 well-aware [1] - 17:8 Wellnitz [2] - 11:24, 13:12 west [3] - 14:22, 15:25, 28:14 wetlands [1] - 39:17 **whim** [1] - 26:18 white [2] - 19:24, 20:1 whitewash [1] - 10:2 whoever's [1] - 66:20 whole [2] - 15:6, 49:22 **wholly** [1] - 69:15 width [3] - 40:16, 40:18, 40:20 Wiest [2] - 1:14, 59:15 willing [6] - 13:16, 19:3, 45:19, 68:3, 72:15 willingness [2] -20:11, 72:16 willy [1] - 54:11 willy-nilly [1] - 54:11 wish [7] - 31:19, 35:23, 53:14, 60:9, 64:21 witness [3] - 62:11, 62:12 witnesses [9] - 7:8, 59:4, 59:5, 59:6, 59:7, 62:6, 62:8, 62:13, 62:25 Wittler [2] - 1:23, 78:18 **WITTLER** [1] - 78:5 wondering [2] - 12:3, 34:12 word [9] - 22:20, 38:1, 40:1, 43:22, 43:23, 45:5, 46:8, 47:17, 68:1 wording [1] - 43:25 words [1] - 29:7 workable [1] - 56:15 world [2] - 26:11, 34:2 worms [1] - 22:12 worth [1] - 35:2 wrestled [1] - 67:14 writing [4] - 43:16, 43:20, 46:15, 46:18 written [1] - 43:11

Y

Yankton [3] - 4:9, 4:12, 4:16 year [4] - 32:5, 52:16, 54:21, 73:13 years [12] - 9:3, 46:10, 51:15, 52:17, 52:20, 53:17, 53:23, 54:19, 61:10, 62:23, 66:5, 73:18 years' [1] - 53:20

Z

zoomed [1] - 15:5

X

XL [3] - 3:9, 3:12, 3:19